THE SECOND PART OF THE QUAKERS QUIBBLES,

Set forth

In a **Reply** to a **Quibbling** pretended Answer of *G. Whiteheads*, Intituled the **Quakers Plainness** &c.

WHEREIN,

Many more of their *Quibbles* and Equivocations are manifested.

Also the Comparison betwixt the pretended Prophet **Muggleton** and the **Quakers** Justified to be True, Rational, and necessary:

Whereunto is added an Advertisement to Mr. *W. Penn*, *George Whitehead*, and the Quakers.

TOUCHING

Their Jesuitical Shifts, Evasions, and unparallel'd CONFIDENCE; Their grand Mystery of directing the intention: with their Pope-like Power to Sanctify and unsanctify Words.

By the same indifferent Penn.

Job. 21. 34. *How then comfort ye me in vain, seeing in your answers there remaineth falshood.*

LONDON,
Printed for *F. Smith* at the *Elephant* and *Castle* in *Cornhil* near the *Royal-Exchange*, 1675.

THE CONTENTS,

THE *Epistle to the Unprejudiced Reader, demonstrating how* G. W. *hath with his* own *hands* destroyed *his* own Cause, *and pluckt up by the Roots, the grand Principles of the* Quakers *Religion.*

The Introduction *being some Remarks on* G. W's *Preface, and his Treatise in general,*

SECT. I. *Wherein the* Author *clears himself of self-contradiction and charges* G. W. *with several* Self-contradictions *or* Inconsistences *&* *new* Quibbles.

SECT. II. *Setting forth the* Quakers Quibbles, *Equivocations and Confusions about* JESUS CHRIST, *his* Manhood, *his* humane Nature, *his* Person, *his* Body, *and his* Flesh.

SECT. III. *Demonstrating the* Quakers Quibbles *about, and Ignorance of the* True SPIRITS Evidence *and Demonstration, who deny the* Gift *of* Tongues, *and* Signs, *&c.*
As also of the Quakers Miracles, *and Pope* JOAN.

SECT. IV. *Justifying the* Comparison *betwixt* Muggleton *and the* Quakers, *to be both true, rational, honest and necessary.*

SECT. V. *Touching* Sabellius *and the Agreement of the* Quakers *Doctrine, with his touching the three* Persons, *notwithstanding their* Quibbling.

An ADVERTISEMENT *to* George Whitehead W. Penn *and the* Quakers, Touching,

I. *Their* JESUITICAL Shifts and Evasions *in answering their* Opponents *Books.*

II. *Their unparallel'd* Confidence *in their Vindications of their grand Prophet* G. Fox's *Falsities, and* Nonsence.

III. *Their grand Mystery of* DIRECTING *the* INTENTION *in matter of* Blasphemy.

IV. *Their POPE-like* Power *to* Sanctify *and* unsanctify *words at their Pleasure.*

The Quakers Character *of the Quakers Quibbles.*

THE

George Whitehead in his Quakers-Plainness,

P. 14. *Speaking of certain true* Gifts *of the* Spirit, *which were* Spiritual-Gifts, *and* Evidence indeed, *says thus*,

And what if God will not bestow such Gifts and Signs NOW, must we therefore be no Christians?

P. 71. *Speaking of the* Titles *that the* Quakers *use to give to, and write on some of their* Books *says thus*,

Such Titles therefore have been not STRICTLY, but FIGURATIVELY placed upon some Books.

{ *Quis non ridet? Qui non videt*
suo se jugulavit gladio. }

Unprejudiced Readers,

IT is no small thing but well worthy of your serious taking notice, that *G. W.* being by many reputed so close, so cunning and crafty a Man (as no doubt, but that in some things he is) yet should be so far infatuated and over-shot himself here; as to let fall from his *Penn*, and publish in *Print* to the World, two such *Sentences*, the one by way of *Interrogation*, and the other of *Position*: Which if duly weighed and applied absolutely *destroys* his *own Cause*, and *answers himself* (in effect) in all he writes: *Argumentum ad hominem.*

The

The first by way of *Interrogation*, effectually enervates, and plucks up by the very Roots the whole of *the Quakers Religion.*

1. For put the Case, the Dispute be about *immediate Revelation from God*, which the Quakers assert as one of their grand Principles, and deny others to be true *Christians*, that have it not: Why, *G. W*'s words will as well serve for an Answer against himself. *What if God will not bestow such Gifts now, (as immediate Revelation) must we therefore be no Christians?*

2. So as to *Divine Inspiration* now immediately by the Spirit, as the Apostles had. Why *G. What if God will not bestow such gifts and signs now, must we therefore be no Christians?*

3. So as to being sent and *Commissioned by God*, and *called by the Spirit* to *Propheſy* and *Preach* the *Gospel* as the *Apostles indeed* were in the Primitive Church, and the *Quakers* now pretend to.

Why alas *George! What if God will not bestow such Gifts* and *Signs now? Must we therefore be no Christians?*

4. So for the *Light within*, which the Quakers so much talk of and pretend to, as their great Principle; *What if God will not bestow such Gifts and Light now, must we therefore be no Christians?*

5. So for their Doctrine of *Infallibility*: *What if God will not bestow such a Gift now, must we therefore be no Christians?*

6. So for their Doctrine and Pretence of the *Gift* of discerning of Spirits: *What if God will not bestow such a Gift now, Must we therefore be no Christians?*

And thus you see, how by this Question he cuts the throat of all their own Pretensions, and shakes the very foundation of his own and the Quakers Religion.

'*BUT can any be so ignorant as to think that God will in-*'*spire, call, send by Commission, persons immediately, and give*
'*no such* Gifts *or* Signs, *that may* distinguish *them from others,*
'*whereby we may* certainly *know they are so inspired, call'd*
'*Commissioned, and sent; and not* Pretenders only?

The second by way of *Position*, puts such an Answer into the Mouths of *George Whitehead's* and the *Quakers* Opponents, that if they please to make use of it in like manner as *G. W.* himself hath done, *He*, nor all the *Quakers* in *England* can never be able either to confute or confound their Adversaries. For let *W. P.* or *George* himself, object what they can against them, let them but have, and take the like Liberty as *G. W.* himself hath here done, which they cannot refuse to others, they using it themselves; without the greatest injustice and unreasonableness (not to say impudence)

impudence) and it will be impoſſible for the Quakers to fix any thing upon them: let them but ſay (as why may they not as well as the Quakers, if they have but ſo much confidence) *ſuch titles or words are not ſtrictly but figuratively placed in or on our Books* And all's done. And therefore here I think, I might on this ground of the Quakers (if they will have that to be admitted) undertake to do Mr. *Hicks* that ſervice *Gratis*, and *G. W.* alſo, (though I never promiſed it to one or other, nor was deſired by either of them to do it) as to anſwer all *G. W*'s ſecond part of the *Quakers Plainneſs*, or at leaſt to *enervate the chief ſinews* of it, only uſing of *George's* own words, *Mutatis Mutandis*. As for example, how ſilly is it for thee *G. W.* to take exceptions againſt the *Title* of his Book (and that was one of the chiefeſt matters of the Charge at the firſt, till the Anabaptiſts had pretty handſomly handled you and beat you off from that, by producing a Book or Books of your own Friends, who writ after the ſame manner;) A DIALOGUE *betwixt a Chriſtian and a Quaker*: why cannot *T. Hicks* tell thee (like as thou thy ſelf art ſo ſilly in thy own caſe to tell him) that *ſuch a Title* was not STRICTLY but FIGURATIVELY placed on his Book? and then for all the reſt of his *words*, wherein *W. P.* and thou chargeſt him with *Forging*, and *Forgeries*, *Slanders* and *Lies*; Thou haſt here taught him a ſhort way to the wood, and ſo may Anſwer thee if he pleaſe, all in few words. *Such Titles, ſuch words or ſayings, are not ſtrictly, but figuratively placed and put down in his Dialogues*: and thus *George* himſelf hath taken the pains to anſwer and confute himſelf, and hath with one blaſt of his mouth, blown away thoſe diſmal great charges of *Lies* and *Forgeries* laid on his Adverſaries. Oh! kind-natured Man! But I dare ſay it was againſt his intention, only he could not tell how to clear his Friends otherwiſe (from other Mens charge of *Blaſphemy*) *viz. for preferring their pittiful Pamphlets to the Holy Scriptures*; and *ſo by ſhunning one Rock, he hath ſplit himſelf on another.*

I am of the Opinion that when *T. Hicks* comes to underſtand this, he will ſay that he is as much beholden to *G. W.* for making his way ſo eaſie by this one *Sentence* as by any advice twenty of his Friends could give him.

Now I would not have any Quaker miſtake me, and ſay I deny *all figures*, for I own that there are ſome *Metaphors* in the *Scriptures* and that ſome *Parables* are therein written, which muſt *neceſſarily* be interpreted *Metaphorically* and *Figuratively*; but this I deny, *that therefore the whole Scripture is a Figure, or all of it to be figuratively interpreted.* This I only hint, on purpoſe

pose to prevent the *Quakers* mistake who when they please I find will wilfully mistake others if they think they can make any advantage by it though never so base: But this I say,

1. That the *Quakers* have excluded themselves from using of *Figures*, they having so long and so often witnessed *that all Figures were ended*, and they were come to the end of all *Figures*, and were come to *Christ the Light*, which was the *substance* and the end of all *Figures*.

2. That if notwithstanding the Quakers (in contradiction to themselves) *will take the Liberty to make use of Figures, in their words and writings, and the Interpretation of them*, then they cannot (without gross injustice and impudent partiality) deny to others the *same* liberty and the *use* of the *same* thing they take themselves, and so the matter will hold good all along. The Apostle says, *Rom.* 14. and 22. *Happy is he that condemneth not himself, in that thing which he alloweth.*

And thus, Courteous Readers, you see, that *G. W.* hath furnished such weapons for his Adversary. That if he will but make use of them as he may, he must mortally wound the Cause of *G. W.* and all the Quakers. And thus *G. W*'s Discourse in so many Pages may be effectually enervated in these few lines. Now this being so, I cannot but foresee (though I pretend not to be any such *Prophet* as the *Quakers* do) that the *Quaker* will wind and twine, kick and winch, flatter and flutter to extricate himself out of this Net and Fetters which he hath so (ingeniously) caught and lockt himself in. But I think now he hath put himself there, I shall be able to hold the Leviathan, and the more Rope I give him, the less danger. (But still I intend to keep him fast).

I cannot but expect there will be great pulling and drawing here by the *Quakers* to *Wiredraw*, *Draw-in*, or *draw-back*; these words again. Surely some curious *mincing and mangling* we must expect about this good time; Now some new-invented QUAKERS QUIRK or QUIBBLE might serve at a dead lift, to *extenuate*, *divide*, *distinguish*, or *extinguish* it into *Atomes*. What can they find better now than a *Jesuitical equivocation*? But if they served seven years at *Rome* for it, yet 'tis a Question whether it will quit their cost; for *G. W.* knows (it seems) it is a *scornful* fellow he hath to deal withal; *that will believe no more of the Quakers pretences than other mens, without* BETTER PROOF. 'Tis ten to one if the more they *flutter*, they do not more *be-fetter* themselves; they cannot thus *dance in* in a Net, but some Body will see them, and they are as easily seen *through* as they boast they can see *through* others.

G.

To the Reader.

G. Fox in the Epiſtle before *G. W's Divin. of Chriſt*, hath theſe words [*We Charge thee, ſhew us a verſe in Scripture that ſpeaks ſuch Language, and where one word may be put for another by Metalepſis? and ſo leave People in doubts and Queſtions.*]

Thou mayſt ſee, *Courteous Reader*, the intent of this Epiſtle is not to *praiſe* or *commend* the following *Diſcourſe* to thee, let it ſpeak for it ſelf, and as thou *findeſt*, ſo *Judg*; but not without throughly conſidering of it, laying aſide all *Partiality* and *private* Intereſt to particular *Sects*; otherwiſe if thou art byaſſed either to the *Quakers* or *Baptiſts*, or any other, more than to *Reaſon* and *Truth it ſelf*, it will prove the more difficult for thee to *Judg aright*, For the firſt thing a Man muſt do (according to wiſe *Charon's* advice) that would find *Wiſdom* and embrace the *Truth*, is to *diſingage* himſelf and *diſcharge his underſtanding of all his former* (*and prejudicate*) *Opinions*; *yea, though in themſelves ſome of them may be true, and take no more of them up again*, than what he ſhall find ſure *evidence*, good *Authority*, or ſound *Reaſon* for: and as to the *reſt*, I have for many years thought it *better* either to *ſuſpend* ones judgment, or to acknowledg ones *fallibility* or *Ignorance*, till *better* and *certainer evidence* preſents; than vainly to *dogmatize* and proudly to *pretend* a certain *knowledg* of things or principles where we have not ſo clear and undoubted *evidence*, as if we ſhould (ſo weakly) think, that our own *fancies* and meer *pretences* muſt indeed be or ſerve for *reaſon* and *evidence* to all others, eſpecially if it be well conſidered how *ſtrong* & *ſtrange impreſſions* that one humour in Men's Bodies, *viz. melancholly* alone, will ſometimes make in peoples *fancies* & *imaginations*, which humor many think was very *predominant* among the *Quakers* at their firſt coming up, and may be yet among ſome of them though others of them are grown pretty ſolly, and will take a Cup of the Creature as other Men may do in a Civil way to refreſh their hearts:

Therefore to conclude, if any will *Judg* with *ſound Judgment* they ought to lay aſide all *Prejudicate* Opinions they have received, either by *Education* or otherwiſe; and ſo if you ſhall think good, you may pleaſe to read on, and I ſhall ſubſcribe,

Your true Friend,

Thomas Thompſon.

ERRATA.

READER,

THE Authors Diſtance not admitting him to attend the Preſs, there hath happened ſome ſmall faults and omiſſions of Interlined words, the moſt material of which he intreats thee in the firſt place to correct with a Pen. p. 3. l. 4. *dele* no, l. 5. *r.* ſhalt. p. 13. l. 33. *r.* give. p. 17. l. 6. *r.* however. p. 28. l. 7. *r.* Quakers. p. 35. l. 1. *f.* may, *r.* ſhould. p. 36. l. 18. *r.* as hath Eſſentially. p. 37. l. 26. *r.* ſome of themſelves. p. 49. l. 31. ad 20th. p. 52. l. 29. *f.* Sign, *r.* Signs. ſee p. 51. l. 6. *f.* Prophecy, *r* Miracles. p. 54. l. 10. *r.* pay andrad. p. 55. l. 30. *r.* Call. p. 60. l. 21. add 8th. p. 61. l. 18. *r* this oppoſers. p. 64. l. 29. *dele* can. *and add* ( ) p. 66. l. 10. *add* ( ) p. 67. l. 10. *r.* this (ſo called) p. 81. l. 21. *r.* Quakers in their conceits, p. 86. l. 24. *f.* may be, *r.* not be. p. 87. l. 6. *f.* Plumbs, *r.* Plums. p. 93. l. 5. *f.* this, *r.* this in it ſelf.

The Second Part OF THE Quakers-Quibbles.

The Introduction containing ſome remarks on G. W's Preface and his Treatiſe in General.

WHereas the Author of the Pamphlet (*Geo. Whitehead*) pretends to Anſwer an Epiſtle directed to *Will. Penn*, ſtiled, *THE QUAKERS-QUIBBLES*, and therein to demonſtrate the *QUAKERS-PLAINNESS*; I find he doth nothing leſs, but inſtead thereof, hath ſet forth many more *QUIBBLES* of his *own*, and the *Quakers*; as I ſhall preſently evince to you: So that if any Perſon ſhould have doubted, when only they ſaw them ſet forth in my Epiſtle; Surely they cannot *now*, that ſo eminent a *Quaker* himſelf hath publiſhed a New Edition of *Quibbles* and *Quirks* too.

And whereas *G. W.* would appear a very plain meek and moderate Man, ſtiling himſelf and the Quakers [*US HIS* [*Gods*] *PEOPLE*] and though he be a *Quaker*, yet would make you believe (if you would be no wiſer) he is a more impartial-Man to his own *Sect*, than that indifferent Perſon, which is neither *Baptiſt* nor *Quaker* (who writ the *QUIBBLES*): But now to uſe his own words, (which ſerve better againſt him, than for him) let the ſerious Reader conſider, and judg

of this man's *Moderation* and *Ingennity*; who in his pretended Answer, instead of impartially relating matters of Fact (for others to judg of) all along bears upon the *Papists* and *me*, with hard Language, Taunts, and Quibbles: comparing *me* and *them* to *Papists* and *Jesuites*, as if we had served seven years at *Rome*; calling us a *Stingy Generation of Hypocrites* and *Apostates*; styling my Epistle *Abusive*, a very *partial* and *scornful Pamphlet*, accusing me with *Injustice*, *Wickedness*, *a dark Spirit*, *Canting*, *Quibbles*, *deceitful Dealing*, and *Hypocritical Pretences*; *absurd*, *unjust*, *partial*, *scornfully aggravated*, *scandalous* and *wicked*; *savouring of meer Ignorance and Envie*; *Idle Quibbling* and *envious Canting*; *Irreverent Quibbling*, *Socinian-like*; *Faithless Demands*, *being in the Unbelief*; *A partial and self-contradictory Pen*, *smiting in the dark*, *envious*, *and unjust*; *with falshoods*, *traducing*, and *Canting-Language*, &c. By which one may perceive, the Man has learned to *Cant*, for in his Book you have this *Canting-Quibbles*, *Envious Canting*, *and Canting Language*; and much more of the like Nature.

How now Quakers! Is this your impartial plain Man? Is this one of your *US GOD'S PEOPLE*? As though your *Sect ALONE*, had a Patent to be *God's People*; Or is it not an *Impropriation*? Can you think he hath well *palliated-matters*, either with indifferency, moderation, or impartiality between us? or that such work will make a Pacification or end the Controversie? No, No. Such *deceitful dealing*, & *Hypocritical pretences*, will stand you in no stead. And yet I must think he hath dealt kindly with me too, that he hath not been pleased to afford me some of his, and his friends Old Language of *Conjurer*, *Sorcerer*, *Blasphemer*,

mer, *Serpent*, *Sott*, and *thou Reprobate*, *thou Dragon*, *thou Antichriſt*, *thou accurſed*, *thou Cain*, *thou dead Beaſt*, *thou art unredeemed from thy vain Converſation*, *and ſo art not juſtified*, *no*, *nor never ſhall be. Oh! thou dark Beaſt and Conjurer*; with much more which *Ed. Burroughs* did uſe in the compaſs of about three Leaves; the like I never heard in my Life before, from one Man: And what think you, ſhould be the occaſion of all this; no more but a Miniſters ſending or propoſing twenty Queſtions to him, whereas he and they have put hundreds and hundreds of Queſtions to others. I am of the Opinion, that any ſober Man which ſhall read this, would hardly think it credible, but that he may ſee it in *Ed. Burroughs* work, *pa.* 29. and ſo on. And Reader, that thou mayeſt know that *George Whitehead* himſelf hath been no ill Proficient in this *Quaking* School of *Quakers* Compliments (and by the way note theſe are the men that are offended at uſing the word *Sir* or *Sirs*) I will give you but a taſte, only what you may find in a leaf and two lines more, in one of his Books; I dare affirm you will ſay it's proof enough and too much for a thouſand leaves of any ſober man's! The Book is intituled *ISHMAEL AND HIS MOTHER CAST OUT INTO THE WILDERNESS among the Wild Beaſts of the ſame Nature*; in Anſwer to Mr. *Townſend* Miniſter in *Norwich*, ſet forth by *G. Whitehead* and three other Quakers, which they ſay, was *GIVEN FORTH FROM THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD IN THEM*; p. 11, 12. *THOU PRIEST OF BAAL, FOR THAT IS THY NAME*; *thy lies are made manifeſt*; *ſhame covers thy face*; *THOU FULL OF ROTTENNESS, and moſt FILTHY Dreams, THOU BLIND SOT, SEE thy Confuſion. They that are not ſtark blind may*

ſee thy Rottenneſs and thy Foundation, to be in the mire and dirt, and may ſee Thee to be a SENSLESS NATURAL BRUIT-BEAST; *Who with thy lies, art* MADE *to be taken and* DESTROYED. OH! THOU BLASPHEMER, and *Slanderer of the Juſt, when wilt thou ceaſe from thy* LIES and BLASPHEMY —— *Prieſt, to conclude thy filthy rotten ſtuff, thou ſayeſt they that make not the Word of God the Rule for their Actions, are led either by their own Fancies, or the Devils Temptations, or both. Thou* PRIESTOWNSEND, *art here laid open; & thou art uncovered, and here thou art found to be a denier of the Word* and *Rule*, and *Foundation*; and *thou art led by thy Dreams*, and *Fancies*, and *thy Foundation is in the Duſt &* THOU ART RESERVED IN EVERLASTING CHAINS, UNDER DARKNESS, FOR EVERLASTING FIRE. *And here thou in all theſe thy Lies,* ART SHUT OUT FROM GOD, and *all the Children of God, among the* DOGS *and* SORCERERS, *and* THE LAKE IS THY PORTION, *which is the portion of all Lyers.* THUS *have we returned a* FULL *Anſwer unto thy ſenſeleſs ſtuff*, &c. Pag. 10. THOU BLIND BEAST —*Thou that ſayeſt that the* SCRIPTURES REVEAL GOD, THOU ART A LYAR.

Theſe are his words, and much more (which I am weary of Tranſcribing) in two Pages, and two lines only; and the reſt of the Book is much of the ſame ſort: And what do you think all this was for, that ſhould be ſo high a Provocation? Only, the Miniſters ſaying *that the Scripture was our Rule ſo long as we live on Earth*, or to that effect.

Now for *G. Whitehead* and his fellows, to entitle and Father on the *HOLY GHOST*, ſuch Beaſtly rotten

rotten ſtuff on *SUCH AN OCCASION*, and ſay, that this their rayling curſing and damning a man *everlaſtingly, for ſuch a cauſe, was given forth by the SPIRIT OF GOD*, as they audaciouſly do, how nigh it borders on *BLASPHEMY INDEED*, I leave the ſerious Reader to Judg; and conſider, whether theſe Fruits do not more reſemble thoſe of the *FLESH*, than them of the *RIGHT SPIRIT*; do but compare them with the notes the Apoſtle gives you, *Gal.* 5. 19, *&c.*

Let the Quakers at other times make what fair pretences they will, *By their Fruits you ſhall know them*, and our *Saviour* ſaith, *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth ſpeaketh.*

This was not done in haſte, only on a *ſuddain* ſurpriſe of *paſſion* (which might have been the more excuſable) or upon the higheſt *provocation*, but upon ſuch deliberation as Men uſe to take in writing of Books, and upon a Conſultation and Approbation of three or four Quakers together, *UPON NO OTHER OCCASION THAN WHAT YOU HAVE HEARD*, which ſeems ſo *abominably groſs*, that I am doubtful while I am writing, my *Reader* may ſuſpect it; and ſome *Quakers* pretend, I have wronged *G. Whitehead*. Wherefore that all doubtful perſons may be ſatisfied that I have not wronged them, it's my intention (if conveniently I can) to procure the Bookſeller to let *G. Whitehead's* Book be ſhown at the Shop for their ſatisfaction. If this be their *Spiritual Heavenly Doctrine*, their *immediate Revelation, and infallible Inſpiration*, God preſerve me from it, and from ſpiritual pride; and keep me humble and little in my own eyes, ſtill to confeſs my *fallibility*, whil'ſt it pleaſes him we ſhould be in

this *state* and *condition*. Possibly one may find the *worst of the Rabble*, the very dregs and wickedness of the World, INSPIR'D with such-like RAILING and *damning* language upon slight occasions: But hardly any where else, that I know of, except among the *Quakers*, or *Muggletonians*, who have used it so *frequently* as if they took the greatest Pride in it: As though they think themselves set over all others to to judg and damn them in a serious manner at their pleasure. If I should believe such a cursing damning Spirit in the *Quakers* to be the *Spirit of God*, then on the same ground, I must believe *Muggleton's Spirit* to be the *Spirit of God*; for his is likewise a cursing damning Spirit, to such as oppose him. But in this respect *Muggletons* spirit is the more charitable of the two, that he curses only the Ministers, and such as pretend they have a Commission to be teachers; But the people that hear them, he says, may be saved if they do not personally oppose him or his Commission. Then judg, sober Reader, where you think the *malicious Spirit* reigns most now? which is the best *language*, and which sort of *Complements* is unfittest to be used among civil persons and sober Christians? Oh! that men should strain at such a term as *Sir*, and yet can open their black mouths in such *foul terms*, and *Titles* as you have heard.

Now if all this (which is my chief aim herein) will not bring them to *Repentance* for, nor *perswade* them to leave off, such *censuring* and *hard speeches*, or *shame* them out of the so *common* and *frequent* use of it; to those that see not ground sufficient to believe them, I do here let them know, from henceforward, I shall not tye my self up, from using such a *Liberty* of Speech as I shall judg *meet*; however I'le endeavour to use as little

as

as conveniently I can (not being over-fond of it) I being ſtill of opinion that to tell a Man *he lies*, is no *good Anſwer nor Argument*, & that the *frequent uſe* of it (as the *Quakers* do) becoms not a well-civiliz'd man overmuch. Where he begins to his *unprejudiced Reader*, p. 3. his words are *General*, and will ſerve the *baptiſts* turn, or another *Profeſſion* as well as, if not better, than his: They can write this againſt thee *G. W.* and thy Friends, *viz.* [If the TRUTH could have been overcome by falſhood, or buried under reproaches, or ſtopt with Popular Clamors, or undermined by the ſecret Combinations of its Adverſaries, or ſuppreſt by Injuſtice or Partiality; I confeſs theſe implacable and envious Men, who are chiefly concerned againſt us, would have had the day, and their Iniquity been triumphant, and remained uncontrouſable. But ſuch their Weapons and Engines, have not prevailed, nor ever ſhall effect the Enemies Deſigns againſt God's Cauſe or Heritage; Had they been Men of *Tender Conſcience*, or reſpected the *Honour of Religion* more than *Intereſt* and *Popular fame*, they would not have given us occaſion for theſe publique Conteſts, neither by abetting a *manifeſt Forger*, nor by *lying Pamphlets* or *falſe* Relations, that they ſo frequently bring forth, and cauſe to be ſpread againſt us: But their hard Hearts, their fretful ſtriving Spirits vent forth their *Envy*, and declare their *Spleen* and *ill-will* towards us, only that they want Power to effect their *Revenge* upon us: to evince this, I could give divers Inſtances, that an *Inveterate Perſecuting Spirit* hath long been, and yet lives and works in divers of theſe *Quakers*, *Teachers* and *Leaders*.]

They can if they pleaſe, call *you* as *you* do *them*, a *ſtingie Generation of Hypocrites and Apoſtates*, many

of you having (as they say) been but *Apostates* from their Church, and they can tell you, that many such of late do busie themselves, and take Counsel together like malicious incendiaries against them: But that God will bring their Counsel to naught, and *scatter the proud in their Imaginations*; And that they have a secret sadness and sorrow of Spirit, because of the great *loss*, *declension*, and *Apostacy*, that divers even of these *Quakers* are fallen into. Oh! the former Zeal, Religion, tenderness of Conscience, *&c.* But now as one that is a *Quaker* himself hath plainly told you, *The old Serpent is got up into you again, and you are run into the World, and the fashions and delights thereof again, and that you are run into outward forms, and have lost the Spirit and the power that once you enjoyed, and now you are become as Worldly, Proud, and Covetous, as some others are.* As to your *Sufferings*, if you would have me guided by that meerly, then I must abundantly prefer the *Church of England*, and *Reformed Churches* beyond-Sea; Nay and the *Churches* in *Poland*, to be in the *Truth*, before yours; for that all their *Sufferings* for *Religion*, have been more and eminenter, than yours, in several respects: First, in the *extremity* of the punishment and sufferings themselves; how many of the *Church of England* (which you have so much condemned) have expir'd in the flames for the *defence*, and *Testimony* of their *Religion*! how many strange, cruel tortures, and bloody massacres, have they had, which I did not ever hear that you have sufferred in such a degree! Though I could heartily, with all my Soul wish, that you had not suffered so much, as heretofore you have done. 2. In respect to the *number* of sufferers, how *many thousands, and ten thousands*, Butchered at a time,

time! you only had *some few* happened to dye in Prison, which yet I wish might have been prevented. 3. In respect of *duration and continuance* for many years. Yours but for a short time, and blessed be God that hath inclined the heart of our *King* to *mercy*. Thus you see clearly, that in this *Proof* or *Evidence*, the *reformed Churches* beyond the Seas, and the *Church of England* doth far exceed you. As for *W. P*'s *sincere-heartedness*, p. 5. I have not much to say for it; 'tis likely, I may have somewhat to say against it if occasion be offered; but as for his *Zeal* I am apt enough to believe, that it sometimes outruns his knowledg. But why might not this *sincere-hearted, and Zealous Man, W. P.* Answer this Epistle, it being particularly directed to him? could any person do it better than one that was sincere-hearted, and Zealous too? If *W. P.* had Answered it, and he indeed so sincere-hearted as *G. W.* pretends, I should have been glad of it; for then he had saved me much of this labour which *G. W.* hath put me to, by reason of his *unsincerity*, and *double-heartedness*, in his pretended Answer; Or did *G. W.* Answer it, that so he might set out the praise of *W. P?* Because it was not so convenient for *W. P.* to commend himself in his *own Person*, as it was hinted of *Hickeringel*. But it seems (*W. G.* says) *I thought meet* (whether he mean the *Man George*, or the *Light within*, I know not,) *to write that brief Tract though it be not directed to me*] Well *George*, since I could not have an Answer from *W. P.* it seems I must be contented with such an Answer as thou wilt give me. Or, dost thou only intend to *Practice* here, as I observe thou didst in the late *Dispute?* first endeavour to throw off all by *Circumlocutions* and *Evasive* words; and if that will not

do.

not do, then *W. P.* to come in either *openly*, or *covertly* to thy relief: We shall see whether this will be the sequel of thy undertaking and Answer, and not that sincere-hearted Man, to whom it was directed; and so I perceive I am like but to have an insincere Answer.

[*We find the said Pamphlet subscribed with the Name Thomas Thomson. Whether this be the real Author's Name (says he) some question.* But he doth not tell us who questioned it, though the *Book-seller* will tell you if you question him, That *G. VV. himself*, & others of the *Quakers* have so much, and often questioned him about it (as if they had had some power of the POPISH INQUISITION) that he could not be quiet for them (they more than once gathering a Multitude of People about his Shop) by their crying, BRING OUT THE MAN, BRING OUT THE MAN TO US, LET US SEE HIS FACE. Why *George*, what wouldst thou do with him? I assure thee he hath a Nose in his Face, as well as any Quaker hath: What if the Author, instead of *Tho. Thomson* had subscribed M. A. could not *VV. P.* have joyned N. (after *VV. L*'s way of Addition) and then have read it thus, A MAN? But since thy friends so MAGISTERIALLY commanded this poor Man (the Author of that moderate Epistle) to be brought forth to them, 'tis happy for him that thou art so ignorant (for all thy boasting Revelations) and that thy Light leaves thee in so much darkness of the Author, that thou canst not tell (when thou readest it,) whether it is the real Author's Name or no; for if he had been brought forth at the QUAKERS MANDAMUS, he could not tell what QUAKERS SPIRITUAL-COURT, might have been erected for him; neither could he have hoped to have faired bet-

ter

ter *there* than in the POPISH INQUISITION, if you had but as much power: But bleſſed be the Lord that as yet you have not. It appears the Author did not only believe, but now experiments to be true what he wrote, *viz.* That he had ground to queſtion, whether your pretending to *Inſpiration*, and *immediate Revelation*, was not only a *bare pretence*, and *ſelf-confidence*, without having ANY MORE to ſhow for it than OTHERS had? Otherwiſe, if what your great Prophet *Ed. Burroughs* ſaid, be true, that the Spirit of Chriſt gives infallibility of Judgment, and diſcerning *into all caſes and things*; and that he had believed you had had it, he could then never have imagined you ſhould at all have doubted, but have been infallibly aſſured, whether that Epiſtle was writ by the perſon that ſubſcribed it or not. But what if it happen that you are not acquainted perſonally with the *Author*, are there not a thouſand, and a thouſand, that you do not perſonally know? *Is the Author or his Book ever the worſe or better for that?* ſurely no.

Suppoſe, the *Author* be a private perſon, and is not ambitious to ſeek the publick applauſe of Men, what haſt thou to ſay to it? What if he dwells fifty or ſixty Miles from *London*, or that his occaſions call him to *Cheſter*, *Ireland*, or any other remote place? Muſt he come up to *London* of neceſſity to be *gazed upon* by the *Quakers*? is this reaſonable think you? What does my *perſon* ſignifie to the *merit of the Cauſe*? that's that which they ought to mind, if they were ingenuouſly honeſt, and not my *perſon*: Whatſoever that may be to the *reputation* of an *Opinion*, I am ſure it is nothing to the TRUTH of it, that ſuch or ſuch a Man holds it; as one of the *Church of England hath*

hath rationally ſaid (whom doubtleſs the *Quakers* muſt acknowledg to be an *indifferent perſon*, and not intereſſed in the late diſputes); and therefore it ſeems very abſurd, and ridiculous in any *Argument* to meddle with that, which nothing concerns the *Queſtion*: Beſides, no *Cauſe* ſtands in need of ſuch *mean* and *unmanly Artifices*, but ſuch an one as is *extreamly baffled*, yea *deſperate*; and even then are they (ſays he) the *worſt Arguments* in the World to ſupport it; for *quick-ſighted* men, will ſee through the *Duſt* they endeavour to raiſe, and thoſe that are *duller* will be apt to ſuſpect from their being ſo angry and walpiſh that they have but a *bad matter* to manage. I wiſh the men that I have now to deal with, were arrived to this degree of perfection, that they had ſo much *light* and *rationality*, as even one of that *Church* (which they have condemned as being in the dark) to their ſhame doth ſee and declare.

But to return, at laſt it ſeems, *George* hath hit on't when he tells you [*What-ever he be, he writes like a confident Controuler of W. P. and the Quakers, and would ſeem to be ſome body*] pag. 6th. Well ſaid *George*, a thouſand to one elſe, but that he was *ſome body*, except he was all *Spirit*, and no *Body*, which I am apt to think *George* himſelf is no, tas much as he pretends to the *Spirit*. [*I! But he writes like a Confident Controuler* of *W. P. and the Quakers.*] And why is *VV. P.* ſuch a *Gent.* that he may not be upon any Terms *controuled?* Or the *Quakers* ſuch ingroſſers of *confidence* that none may uſe it but themſelves? What's *VV. P.* a *Pope* or a *Prince* that he muſt not be controuled? Oh! daring *ſome Body* that preſumes ſo much. What, *controul VV. P.* what *controul* the *Quakers*! And which is worſt yet,

I find *George* is a little angry (for want of other matter) that *ſome of the Anabaptiſts have commended it for an ingenuous piece*] How! Is that poſſible? to be *ingenuous* and yet *controul VV.*P. ? how can any *Quaker* admit of that? But ſays *George* (another of the moſt material things he hath to find fault withal) *his Complement* of SIR, and THOU SIR, and THOU, as alſo, Mountebank Fool, *&c.* with much more ſuch Language to *VV.* P. looks but oddly; a ſtrange way of *Complementing* (ſays G.)! from ſuch a Perſon as would be thought a Moderator.] Now Reader whether this be even or odd, I have not reckoned up, but I think it was very oddly done of *G. VV.* to expreſs himſelf no evener; for here the Man is pleaſed to find fault with the word THOU, as well as *thou Sir.* When ſurely he forgets that one of his great Prophets (*G. F.* and others) thought the *Quakers* ſuch *Shuttle-Cocks* as that they had need of ſo large a a *Battledoor* for to learn them, HOW MAN THOU'D GOD, and GOD THOU'D MAN. Oh pure Language! Is not this Spiritual-Doctrine think you? Such as the *Quakers* are likely to be *ſent with*, and *Commiſſioned* from Heaven about? And yet now are theſe Quakers ſo faced about, that one may not *thou VV.* P. without being worthy of *Reproof*; whether this be *folly* or *Pride*, I leave others to enquire. But, ſays G. *VV.* [*a ſtrange way of Complementing!*], viz. *Sir, and thou* Sir, *&c.*] well, well, G. gives us hopes then that he will ſet up a new and better way of *Complementing*? For here he doth not deny *Complements*, or the way of *complementing*, only gives you to underſtand that mine is a *ſtrange way*, and looks but *oddly*; but yet if G. had not forgot himſelf, it's neither ſo *odd* nor *ſtrange* but that the Apoſtles

uſed

uſed it, *Acts* 14. 14, and 15. Now what wilt thou ſay that *Paul* and *Barnabas* uſed a *ſtrange way* of *Complementing* here? If ſo, when thou ſet's up School, and I find I have need to learn, I'le come to thee; in the mean time I hope thou wilt hold me excuſed. Yet I charge thee to Anſwer if thou canſt, whether the word SIR, is a *Complement*, & if the *Apoſtles* did not uſe it? See *Joh.* 20. 15. But ſee how theſe Men can when they pleaſe, *ſtrain at Gnats, and ſwallow Camels.* To ſay, Sir, is *dangerous*, but to call a Man, *Sott*, and *blind Beaſt*, is with them *Religious*, and pure Language. As for the Word *Mountebank*, I did not ſay *VV. P.* was one; but I ſaid & ſay again, that 'tis no new thing for a Mountebank or Stage-Player to have a *grateful utterance*, or *fluent Tongue*, *&c.* and *ſo, that being a natural or an acquired gift in VV. P. proves not him to be any more immediately inſpired, than it will ſo prove a Mountebank or Stage-player*, and do thou deny it if thou canſt. But whoever the Author be (G. hath it over once more) *his work will further declare what dark ſpirit it came from*, and *that it much reſembles that of a Prejudiced angry* ANABAPTIST, only diſguiſed, &c.] This ſurely ſhould be G's *Maſterpiece*, though he does not know mens *Bodies*, yet he knows their *Spirits*; yet I wonder how the Man ſhould come acquainted with *dark Spirits*, I thinking he had pretended to have no *Converſe* but with *Spirits of Light*. However, I can and do aſſure him, he is miſtaken, and as *ignorant* of one as he confeſſes himſelf of the other; I denying *all prejudiced angry Anabaptiſts Spirits*, as much as he lawfully does or can do. As to this pretended *Anſwer* in *General*, I do further *obſerve* that he *craftily* all along takes me for a *Baptiſt*, or would *jumble* me with them whether

I will or no (though I did ſo ingenuouſly profeſs to *VV. P.* and the World in my Epiſtle, that I was none, nay never was) which he does *wilfully*, that ſo he might in like manner *jumble* his Anſwer, and ſo inſtead of Anſwering me, as at firſt he pretended, he *palpably* and *deceitfully evades* it, and *ſhuffles* me off, ſometimes to, and ſometimes with the *Anabaptiſts*; and this I and you muſt it ſeems take for the *Quakers plainneſs*. Now how he could poſſibly think that I, or if I, that all other underſtanding Readers, would be ſo fob'd off, I cannot imagine: As Dark as I am, I am clear enough ſighted to ſee that, and ſo ſome think I had no need to make a Reply, becauſe he hath wrote almoſt nothing in Anſwer to me, but talks to the *Baptiſts*: Oh poor ſhift! Oh pittiful ſhuffle! ſeen through as it runs through thy Book with half an eye! Yet, however that G. might have no occaſion ~~vainly~~ to *boaſt* of his Quibbling undertaking the QUAKERS-QUIBBLES, I ſhall endeavour to enlighten him where he is wilfully blind, and ſhew him where his real *Fallacy* is inſtead of *Pretended Plainneſs*. And to take that falſe Cover from him, and vindicate the *baptiſts* as to their Innocency in that particular; and for further ſatisfaction to all People, I do hereby declare once more, and affirm, *as in the preſence of God*, That no *Baptiſt*, or *Anabaptiſt* ſo called, did ſee that my *Epiſtle* to *W. P.* till after I had writ it; nor had I any of their *Advice* or *Counſel* for the *writing* of it, or in the *writing of it*, as G. *W.* would maliciouſly & falſly *inſinuate* to the abuſe of them and me, and the world beſides. I ſay if this be the *Quakers-plainneſs*, it is neither *Chriſtian-plainneſs* nor *honeſty*. But I being one of the *Auditors* at the Meeting, and really *obſerving*, (as I told *VV. P.* in my apprehenſion) a great deal of

un-

unfairneſs, *ſubtilty*, and *Quibbling* in the words and carriage of *VV. P.* G. *VV.* and G. *K.* it came into my heart to ſignifie as much in an Epiſtle to *VV. P.* not out of *Pride*, *Envy*, or *Malice*, but in *Sobriety*, and *Love*, (yet *faithfully*) to *admoniſh* him; and becauſe I was plain and down-right with them, in telling them of their *unreaſonableneſs* in ſome particulars, and my deſire of being informed in *Truth* and *plainneſs* (without *Railing* or *Quibbling*) of their *Doctrines* in others, Oh how they *Cenſure* my Epiſtle and me! But I value it not for that I am aſſured from a better and higher *Authority* than theirs, THAT THE CURSE CAUSELESS SHALL NOT COME.

SECT. I.

Wherein the Author *clears himſelf of thoſe* ſelf-Contradictions, *that* G. W. *charges him with*; *and the* Anſwerer *charged with ſeveral* ſelf-Contradictions, *or* Inconſiſtencies.

IN His Firſt Section he is pleaſed to accuſe me, with theſe four things, *p.* 9.

1. Partiality, 2. Confuſion,
3. Hypocriſy, 4. Envy.

But makes not good one of them: now if alone to accuſe would make a Man Guilty, who ſhall, nay who

who can be innocent? As to the First, G. *W.* acquits me himself, *p.* 14. where he says *I have condemned the Baptists as well as them, for wrangling and fighting in the Dark*, &c. And yet if the *Baptists* promote the said Epistle, as such an ingenious or excellent piece, 'tis more than I desire of them; however, thereby they shew more of *Ingenuity*, in *Commending* a Piece, or owning it may be *Ingenious*, notwithstanding it *reproves* them, than you are willing to shew, because it reproves you; who are hardly got so *far* as to be willing to own any thing for *excellent*, that *reproves* or *condemns* you: So here's your own *partiality* demonstrated more than mine. As to the Second, of *Confusion* and *self-contradictions*, He is so kind to nominate but four Particulars; he might as well have pretended, there had been forty-four, for who could hinder him? But since the number he finds is so small, I thank him for easing me, for if he had made ten times as many, they might have been as impertinent and false, and have put me to the more trouble to blow away the dust he would raise, to hinder my Readers Eye-sight.

I have heard say, *That this man hath such a rare Art of making Men contradict themselves, that if one should but say a Groat at one time, & four pence at another, he would go nigh to make his silly Disciples believe that the Man had contradicted himself*; and much after the same rate it fares with me, as I shall now clear to you.

1. The first self-contradiction he charges me with, *p.* 11, is, *Between my commending* W. P. *for an excellent Rhetorician, and fluent Tongue, and so was* Cicero; *and yet telling them, you give occasion to persons to think and judg you a perverse Generation without Order or Rule, Rime, or Reason*: says he, was *Cicero* such an one then?

Reply. Does it follow, That if one says *VV. P.* be like *Cicero* in *one* thing, that therefore he and *all the Quakers* are, (or that *I said* they are) like *Cicero* in *all things*? no surely; let him shew me such a word: Again in *p.* 6. I spake of a *particular person*, viz. *VV.* P. and a *particular Act*, and in *p.* 25. I spake of the *Quakers* carriage *generally*, and then did but say, you *gave occasion* to persons to think and judg you so: I never had such high thoughts of the *Quakers* in *general*, as to think them *fit* to be *compared* to *Cicero* in many things, and where's now the Contradiction? Here nothing remains but one of the Quakers-Quibbles. So this I note for the *first Quibble*, of his *New* Edition.

2. The second he Charges me with, *p.* 11. is for saying, *If* W. P. *had this Gift of a fluent Tongue and good Voyce, meerly by turning Quaker, it would more convince me of the Truth of* W. P's. *Christianity, than all the Arguments I heard that day from him*: and my confessing, *that* St. *Paul saith, Though I speak with the Tongues of Men and Angels*, and *have not Charity, I am become as sounding Brass or a tinkling Cymbal.*

Reply. If there be any *contradiction* here, it must be in *G. W's. Brain*, and not in my *Words*; For I do still say, That the *Gift of Tongues immediately inspired* into those of the *True Church*, upon their *becoming Christians*, (which was *the Gift* I spake of *p.* 7. in express words, *without acquiring it by Study*) was a certain Proof of *Christianity*, yea (and I do now say) *so discriminating*, that I do not know, that ever we find in the whole Scripture, any *others*, but *only Christians*, that were indued with *that Gift* by *immediate Power* and *Inspiration* of the *Holy Spirit*. And accordingly the Apostle *Peter* took

it

it for a *ſufficient* and *undeniable* ſign of their *Belief* and *Chriſtianity*, who had received this *Gift*, upon his Preaching *Chriſt Jeſus* to them, and thereupon commanded them to be *Baptized*, Acts 10. 44. *&c. They which Believed, were aſtoniſhed, as many as came with* PETER, *becauſe that on the* GENTILES ALSO, *was poured out the* GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST, *for they heard them* SPEAK WITH TONGUES: *Then Anſwered Peter*, CAN ANY MAN FORBID WATER, *That theſe ſhould not be Baptized, which have received the* HOLY GHOST AS WELL AS WE? *And he commanded them to be Baptized in the Name of the Lord.* And do thou *G.* deny it (againſt this plain Teſtimony of Scripture) or make the Apoſtle *Paul* to Contradict the Apoſtle *Peter* here, if thy Conſcience can ſerve thee. Therefore *G.* thou art ſo far from proving this a *Contradiction*, that thou haſt committed a great *miſtake*, in ſaying, *That the* GIFT *of Tongues is not a certain proof of Chriſtianity*: wherefore conſider, what thou haſt (it's poſſible, only) raſhly and haſtily aſſerted, and be not aſhamed to confeſs thy Error. But on the other hand, though I owned SUCH A GIFT (as before mentioned, *p.* 7. of my Epiſtle) would be a good Proof to me, of *W. P's Chriſtianity*: Yet I do not, nor never did own, *that Men ſpeaking never ſo* MANY, *nor ſo* EXCELLENT *Tongues by* ACQUISITION AND STUDY, (much leſs that any of *W.* P's. Plauſible Orations or fine Harangues,) *was a certain Proof of Chriſtianity, no, nor any Proof at all*; and thoſe were *the fine words without Charity* I ſpake of *p.* 9. and where's then the Contradiction? Surely in *G.* his own Fancy; *This being natural, mediate and acqui-*

red by Study, but *the other Spiritual, and a Gift immediate from God at an Instant.* And although it is not to be doubted, but that the Apostle *Paul* had learned to speak like an *Orator*, and more *Tongues* than one *by Study, before his becoming a Christian*, he being brought up a *Scholar*; yet suppose it be granted, that he speaks (1 *Cor.* 13. 1.) *of the Gift of Tongues he had immediately*, he doth not say any such thing, *as that it is no certain proof of Christianity to* OTHERS; nay, so far from it, that in *Chap.* 14. *v.* 22. he asserts, *Tongues are for a sign to them that Believe not*, that is, chiefly to *them*; (and in the *Quakers* sence, *such* are *we*, who do not *believe them*:) But that *Charity* which he speaks of, is a Proof of *his*, or a *mans* SINCERITY BEFORE GOD, *that he did make use and imploy those* GIFTS *really in* LOVE TO GOD AND HIS CHURCH, for the P*lanting and edifying of it*, and *not to any by, and base ends*; *which if he should, it would profit him nothing v.* 3. *it would signifie nothing to his own Salvation, though possibly it might to others*: much like to this you have it expressed again by the Apostle in *Chap.* 9. *v.* 27. *But I keep under my Body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have* PREACHED *to* OTHERS, *I* MY SELF *should be a* CASTAWAY. So that TONGUES IMMEDIATELY *inspired* by the *Holy Spirit* are a SIGN and PROOF *to others of Christianity*, wherever that *Gift* was or is found; and CHARITY is a SIGN *and* PROOF *of* a man's *sincerity before* God, *and of his* SINCERE LOVE TO GOD AND HIS BRETHREN *in his Exercise of that* GIFT OF TONGUES, *and other miraculous Gifts which God hath given him for the planting and edifying of his Church.* But what's all this

this to *W. P.* who alas is ſo far from having THAT CHARITY and SINCERITY in the *Uſe* and *Exerciſe* of *thoſe ſpiritual Gifts* of *Tongues* and *Miracles*, for the *love* and *benefit* of the *Church*, that HE hath NONE OF THOSE GIFTS TO USE OR EXERCISE AT ALL? And where's now the contradiction? therefore I muſt note this for *G. W's ſecond* Quibble.

The *Apoſtles* were to ſtay at *Jeruſalem* till they were endued with *power from* on high, *viz. with that Spirit whereby* they were enabled to ſpeak with Tongues, being to *Preach* the *Goſpel* to *all* Nations, and not only to thoſe that underſtood only the vulgar Tongue of the Jewes. But *W. P.* or ſeveral of the *Quakers Prophets* have been ſent to *Preach* the Goſpel (as they pretend) to *Peoples* and *Countrys* that did not underſtand their *Language*, particularly *G. Fox* to *America*, (where he as I have heard) ſent for at once, an *Emperor* and two Kings) to Preach to the *Indians* in *Engliſh*, which they *underſtood* not. Thus have theſe *Prophets* rendered themſelves more *Barbarous* than thoſe *Barbarians* to whom they *Preached*. Had not men the *Light within them* in the Apoſtles *time* as much as now? If the *Light within* is *now* a ſufficient *evidence* of the Truth of the Goſpel, why not then alſo? why ſhould the Apoſtles, *Peter* and *Paul have need of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghoſt* then? and the Apoſtles *George* and *William in theſe days have no need of them at all*?

3. He charges this as a ſelf-contradiction, For ſaying *thou madeſt thy ſelf the Author of a Lye*, and *ſhewedſt thy ſelf not only a Fool, but unjuſt*; and yet that I hint *for W. P. to ſay, It is a Lye*, is *neither Anſwer nor Argument*; and *therefore in Love I ſhould*

adviſe him to leave off ſuch Billinſgate Rhetorick.

Reply. Oh excellent Artiſt! *He leaves out part of my words*, and then tells me I have *contradicted* my ſelf: For theſe words [TO EXPRESS IT IN THY OWN LANGUAGE] he deceitfully leaves out; which I did in my very writing the Epiſtle think of, and put in on purpoſe to prevent any ſuch *miſtake*; for thereby I gave *W. P.* plainly to underſtand, that it was *his Language* and *none of mine*; I did expreſs it in his Language and not my own; that ſo he might be the *more ſenſible* of it..

Now *George*, call to mind thy own words, *p.* 68. *But if you take this kind of unfair Curtailing, which deſtroys the ſence*——is this your *Care and Juſtice*? *would you be thus ſerved, both to wrong me, and abuſe the World or your Reader?* And ſee how out of thine *own* mouth thou haſt *Condemned* thy ſelf, both as a *partial* and *ſelf-contradictory Pen.*

In his 3d. Sect. *pa.* 27, and 28. He is up with it again, as if the man was ſo taken with talking about *Lying, Forgery*, &c. as that then only he was in his natural Element; and rather than he would not make me to *contradict* my ſelf (becauſe in the Margent I quoted the Apoſtles words, *Titus* 3. 2, 3. *Speak evil of no Man, be no Brawlers*,) he will adventure to make *the Apoſtle* contradict or be *inconſiſtent* with himſelf on that ground; for in the very ſame Epiſtle *Cap.* 1. 12. the Apoſtle ſays of the *Cretians*, That a *Prophet of their own ſaid, the Cretians are always Lyars, Evil Beaſts, Slow Bellies*; *This witneſs is true.*

And yet to go round again, *p.* 29. in vindication of *W. P.* he can tell you the *Scripture proves ſuch Lan-*

Language, and cites *Pſal.* 52. 3. *&c.*

Reply. what does the *Scripture* prove ſuch Language for *W. P. and not for others*? Or wilt thou blame others for what thou ſayeſt the *Scripture proves*? But where does the *Scripture* commend the *ſo frequent uſe of it, as you make of it*? And where does the *Scripture prove* the uſe of it *at all* on ſuch *Occaſions*, as many times you uſe it on? The Scripture commends *Wine*, and *Timothy* is commanded to uſe a little with his Water, but yet uſing *too much* of it may be vitious, and that was it I condemned in *W. P. viz. uſing ſuch language ſo frequently*, and *inſtead of Arguments, or a better Anſwer to his Adverſaries.* But that *G. W.* may take a liberty to ſay any thing, though never ſo palpably falſe, appears in *p.* 29. where he ſays, [*That it ſeems it is the Language, Lyer*, and *Forger*, &c. *that I find fault with, and not the Application thereof.*]

Reply. That's a *miſtake* alſo, for that was the very thing I found fault with, *viz. the ſo very frequent uſing* or *applying* it to your Adverſaries; for thus are my words, *p.* 25. I will crave leave to mention one thing more of my obſerving; and that is, thy *ſo oft uſing* the groſs word of *Lying* and *Forgery*, and *Lyar*, and *Forger*; *eſpecially in thy Books againſt* T. H. that it will hardly ſtand with good manners; ſuch Language to be SO COMMON and FREQUENT, *methinks* ſutes not well, *&c.* Which words I ſhould think ſtill were civil and moderate enough, if they were not *prejudiced* againſt all that is againſt them. Wherefore this I note for G. *W's.* third Quibble: beſides a double falſhood, firſt in *leaving out* part of my words, and ſecondly, ſaying I did not find fault with *the Application* of it which I did.

4. In the last place, he would make this a *self-contradiction, viz.* my saying, PERHAPS *W. P. is of a different mind from some of his friends, as it is reported, &c. And my speaking of W. P's being engaged with such a People, and having received their Principles.*

Reply. Is it possible that ever any man that's *sober* and in his *Wits*, could have the *Confidence* to publish his own *ignorance* so, as to call that a self-Contradiction, when he himself acknowledges, I say but PERHAPS, and neither *affirm* nor *deny* any thing *positively*, and how then can this be a contradiction? and yet my words run more full, if it can be, p. 20. Or IF PERHAPS thou art of a different mind from some of thy friends *in* THIS PARTICULAR, why would'st thou not honestly tell us so? And besides, if I had laid it down positively (whereas you see I did it otherwise) yet would it not have proved a *Contradiction*: For *W. P.* might have received the *Quakers* Principles at *one time*, and yet *afterwards* come to vary in some *one* particular, though not in *all*: and I believe I can prove if there be occasion, that most of the *Quakers* themselves, have *changed*, or *varyed* in *some* of their *Principles* or *Practices*, from what they *at first Practised* and gave forth. Now I do admire with what face G. W. can Print such stuff as this, and I do speak seriously, I cannot imagine how he can satisfy his *Conscience* in dealing so deceitfully, as he must needs know he does here with me, if he knows any thing: Is it possible that these words [IF PERHAPS] should be *one Member of a Contradiction*, as I writ it? How can I possibly think, he can be a Man *truly fearing God*, that makes *no Conscience* of dealing thus *unfairly*, and representing things

things so *falsly* to his Reader by *perverting* the sence of my words? which I leave every Reader to Judg of, whether this be the *Quakers-plainness*, *detecting Fallacy*, and not rather, *The Quakers Fallacy perverting plainness*; and this therefore I note as his fourth Quibble.

And now I hope G. W. will not say it is *Forgery*, or *Slander*, if they are charged as he relates *p.* 77. *That the Quakers endeavour to Render their Adversaries as Ridiculous as they can, and to make their Friends believe they do nothing but contradict themselves.* But I have this further to say for my self, That if I had indeed committed a *mistake*, or *contradicted* my self, I had that to plead for my excuse, which G. W. commends me for, *p.* 44. that my opinion is, *Humanum est errare*, and that would have born me out, *I honestly and ingeniously* telling him and the World, That I pretended to no such *infallibillity*, as the *Quakers* do.

And now having thus fully cleared my self, I shall try G. W. if he be not *more guilty* of what he *accuses* me, *viz. self-contradictions*, or at least, *Inconsistences* with himself, and whether this man that pretends to *Infallibility*, be any more *infallible* than others, *viz.* 1. What G. W. says *p.* 19. *That they cannot deviate from Scripture-Language in their Creed*, and *they must tell us, that until we bring them plain Scripture that saith, the Human Nature is the Christ, they must rather patiently bear our censure, &c.* Now this I humbly conceive to be *inconsistent* with what G. W. says, (but one page before, *viz. p.* 18.) *Have we not plainly and often confest also, That the Divine Nature or Word cloathed with the most Holy manhood —was and is the Christ.* For I do not find these words

words [*cloathed with the most Holy Manhood*] to be Scripture-Language, and yet G. W. *p.* 18. *admits them in his Creed*, neither do they bring any plain Scripture that *saith so*, and yet they *believe* it, or *confess* it, if G. W. says true. 2. Where G. W. says *p.* 20. *Whether Christs Humane Nature, be a part of Christ, as it was not a Question in Scripture-Phrase or Language, so it was as abruptly and sillily obtruded.* And yet *p.* 22, 23, and 25. he proposes several *Questions*, which are not *in Scripture-Phrase or Language*, viz. [*I ask you if* ANY MORE *of Christ* PROPERLY *dyed than the Body? Do you hold that his Soul, Spirit or Divinity dyed?* and *p.* 44. *And if he was the Son of God, and so Christ before his Incarnation or assuming Flesh?* And many more too long to transcribe. 3. His *blaming* me *p.* 10. for comparing *W. P.* to a *Jesuite*, and yet *p.* 31. He does the same by me, in these words [*Our present opposers do argue as exactly like the Jesuites and Papists against the Protestants, as if they had served seven years at* Rome.

Reader, Judg you if G. hath not now *out-done* me, and in *that very thing* for which yet he accuses me. 4. His *blaming* me *p.* 10. for using *hard Language* and *gross Words*, and yet all along his Pamphlet he uses the same Language or worse, as *p.* 6, 7, *&c. Dark Spirit, silly Drollery, a Stingy Generation of Hypocrites*, and *Apostates, Wicked, Absurd* and *Unjust*, Canting-Language, *Envious Canting, &c.* Now is he not herein *Inconsistent* with himself, and *accuses* that in another, which he *allows* in himself; and so *condemns himself.*

G. W. *p.* 13, 14. Comes to speak of the *gift of Tongues immediately inspired*, which I told W. P.

if

if he had, as the *Primitive-Church* had, would more *convince me*, and *confute the Baptiſts*, than a hundred ſuch days *Diſputing*: But inſtead of making an Anſwer to me, or *ſhewing that W. P.* or ſo much as any *one* member of *his Church* hath *ſuch a gift*, he falls to *asking Queſtions* of the *Baptiſts*. Is this ſome of the *Quakers plainneſs*? of which you ſhall hear more in the third Section, he having there reaſſumed the Anſwering it again.

G. W. *p.* 16. *As for two* of us *ſpeaking together at a time*, and *crying hear, hear*, ſays, *that was to hear him that was to ſpeak*] Yea, but you cryed out and ſpoke much more than *thoſe two words*, and the thing I found fault with, *p.* 11. as *diſorderly*, was *W. P. ſpeaking*, when his *Opponents* were *ſpeaking*, and thy and his, or G. *K*'s. ſometimes making Diſcourſes *together*, and at other times one after another, and ſo *confounding your Diſcourſes* on purpoſe to *evade*, inſtead of diſputing in a *Regular* way; and yet when another went to ſpeak for *Tho. Hicks*, Mr. *Penn* or his friends cryed out, *Hicks, Hicks, Hicks*, it is him we will hear; and this I charged upon *W. P.* as both *diſorderly*, *unfair*, and *unreaſonable*; and let him get off of it, if he can, for thou ſayeſt nothing to bring him off.

Whereas, *G. W. p.* 16. ſaith further, That it is ſuppoſed, that nigh a 100 of the *Baptiſts* would clamour together, and make a hideous noyſe, and *Bawling*, to ſtop him that was about to ſpeak.] 'Tis very probable this in ſome meaſure might be true, but whether the number of nigh a hundred *Baptiſts*, that I cannot ſay; *And juſt ſo I do witneſs the Quakers did in their Turns*, ſeveral of them ſtanding by me that owned themſelves *Quakers*, and *Bawled* out after

ter the same manner: *And can it be evil in the Baptists and good in the Quakers?* And when-as *G. W.* says, *they did not shuffle or boggle at one single Question out of fear, but because it was not W. P's place then to Answer Interrogations and unscriptural-Questions*] a poor shift indeed! *Who shall be Judges of that besides the Quaker?* Thou *G. W.* art no proper Judg in it. The Question was grounded on their *Charge* of your being *no Christians*, and *occasioned by* W. P's own *absurd distinction*, as I writ him. But then as to the *matter* of *Fact*, you here grant, you did so far *boggle*, as to make some *intermission* before an Answer was given.

And as to *W. P.* taking the words out of *T. H's.* mouth, or Answering before *T. H.* made an end of his speech, *W. P.* saying, *That then he owned he could not prove them all*, or to that effect.

G. VV. himself *p.* 17, 28. cannot but own the *matter of Fact*, it was so *palpable*, only he would fain *palliate* it, by saying, that many apprehended *T. H.* made a *stop*,] What then? *G.* (supposing that which yet others deny, that he made any *other stop*, than what is usual to make a mans words *intelligible*) wouldst thou not give a Man *Breath*, or leave to fetch his *Breath*? do you not know that the usual Practice amongst Disputants that will be either *fair* or *honest* is, to ask, *Hast thou said? Or have you done? Is this all? And then truly to repeat the Argument.* But instead of all this, W. P. lay upon the *Catch*, and as it happened, by his rashness *Catcht himself*; and this I apprehended as *unfair* dealing. And what G. W. says further, is yet worse, *viz. p.* 17. [*That VV. P. did not insist on the matter*] For indeed he might well be ashamed to *insist* on it, he finding

he

he had been too nimble, and ſpoke that of *T. H.* which in *the Event* proved *falſe, viz. then he owns he cannot prove them all*, or to that effect, *whereas T. H. owned no ſuch thing.* And ſuppoſe, that what you charged *T. H.* with had been true, to wit, *that he had abuſed you*; will that excuſe you *for abuſing him?* and muſt *VV. P.* ſay a thing of him that was *UNTRUE*, and then afterwards think it enough to ſay, *he did not inſiſt on it*, and not *honeſtly* acknowledg his *miſtake, Error or Falſhood?* No ſurely, and thus you have a full Reply to his firſt Section of Quibbles.

SECT. II.

In Reply to his ſecond Section, wherein is ſet forth the QUAKERS QUIBBLES, EQUIVOCATIONS, and CONFUSIONS *about the* [*Chriſt of God,*] [*his Manhood,*] [*his Humane-Nature,*] [*his Perſon,*] [*his Body,*] [*and his Fleſh.*]

G. W. p. 18. THat we have denied diſtinctions, is falſe; For true and reaſonable ones we deny not.]

1. *Reply.* If this mans own words, had not ſaved me the Labour, I would have proved it, *That they have denyed Diſtinctions*: For if he ſays *true*, And *reaſonable* ones they deny not, then certainly he grants, that *falſe* and *irrational diſtinctions* they do deny, and ſo would make my words good

good: (being laid down *indefinitely* by me:) and thus this great man hath done two things at once, both made good what I said, and *implyed* a contradiction to himself, when he says it is false, that they have denyed Distinctions, which if true, then they have owned *false* or *irrational* ones, as well as *true* and *reasonable* ones; but for further Proof, see G. W's own words, if you will believe him, quoted at the end of this Section: And yet I shall put *G. VV.* to another task as hard as this, by desiring him to assign *by what Rule he knows those* Distinctions *are true, and reasonable which he esteems or calls so.*

For that *distinction* which *VV. P.* used, I said was *absurd* (*p.* 16.) *considering and with respect to the Quakers Principles* of *the Christ*; and *G. W.* lets that alone, being so wise as to say nothing particularly to it, so as to clear it. For *if the body was not the Christ nor any essential part of Christ,* (as the Quakers own it was not) how could *VV. P*'s distinction imply, *as it should do, if it answered the Objection rightly without Quibbling:* THAT THE CHRIST WAS SEEN WITH CARNAL EYES.

For if the *person which they did see with their Bodily eyes was not the Christ,* I do not know how they should *see the Light within,* (*as they call it,*) *or the Deity with their bodily eyes,* and so still then according to the Quakers Doctrine, *the Christ was never seen with Carnal* (*or Bodily*) *eyes,* and *VV. P*'s Distinction *deceitful* only and *absurd.*

G. VV. p. 18. acknowledges, *that they have plainly and often confest, That the* DIVINE NATURE *or Word, cloathed with the* MOST HOLY MANHOOD, *and as having taken Flesh of the Seed of Abraham, was and is the Christ*: Yet, says he, *we*

must

must own, that if he was the Son of God, BEFORE *he took Flesh, he was Christ.* And in *p.* 19. he grants, *he doth not own the Humane Nature is the Christ, for want of Plain Scripture that saith so;* and says *some do conscientiously scruple it, and pretend it is a deviating from Scripture-Language, which they cannot do in their Creed.*]

2. *Reply.* What a pretty medly of *Hypocrisie, Quibbling,* and *Confusion* here is, I will now shew you.

For *Hypocrisie,* how palpable is it, in that they pretend they *conscientiously* scruple owning in their *Creed,* THAT THE HUMANE NATURE IS THE CHRIST, *because, it is a Deviating from Scripture-Language, and they pretend they find no plain Scripture that says so;* when yet at the same time, they tell you, they have often confessed *that the* DIVINE NATURE, or Word as CLOATHED *with the most* HOLY MANHOOD —— *is and was the Christ;* and this they do without *scruple* of Conscience; *And yet there's no plain Scripture that I know of, that says so,* yea, and it is a *Deviating* from *Scripture-Language;* for where can they shew me this Language in Scripture [CLOATHED WITH THE HOLY MANHOOD,] or such a word there as [MANHOOD,] and until they have done that, I must charge them with HIPOCRISY, and their pretended Scruples to be nothing but *pretences* and DECEIT.

3. As to their *Quibbling,* herein it plainly appears, that to blind the eyes of the simple, they sometimes pretend as in *p.* 18. to *own the Holy Manhood to be Christ.* And yet *p.* 19. *Deny the Humane Nature to be Christ.* By the first they would seem as if they owned the Humane Nature to be Christ, when-as indeed

indeed they utterly deny it, as you may see by the Latter.

But since they own, the *Divine Nature* Cloathed with the *most Holy Manhood*, and as *having taken Flesh of the Seed of Abraham, not only was*, but *is* the *Christ*; and yet say that the *Light which is in every Man is the Christ*, I considered with my self, *whether this most holy Manhood was in every Man, and the Manhood was the Light in every Man, or a part of that Light?* Taking these words in their *proper* and *common* signification among us *English Men*, but so I could not find it *consistent* with their Doctrine of the LIGHT WITHIN; and therefore would it not appear a pretty *Quibble*, if some of them do mean by MANHOOD; not MAN *really*, and *essentially*, *but only a* GARMENT, or a certain *quality*, as *Power*, *Fortitude*, or *Valour*? So when they confess *Christ* Cloathed with the most Holy *Manhood*, they mean *Christ* was *Cloathed* with the most Holy Power, Valour *&c.* or *Cloathed with a Garment*? Or else, if they *deny* this, they must *confute* their other *Principle* of the *Light within every Man being the Christ*, or speak as *absurdly*, if they say *Christ's Manhood*, as he is *really* and *essentially Man*, *is within every Man*.

4. And then I further enquire of the Quakers; Whether the most Holy *Manhood* be indeed the *Christ* or a *real part of Christ*? And whether the *Flesh* that *Christ* took of the Seed of *Abraham* (since AS SUCH, *G. VV.* sometimes, *viz. p.* 18. confesses he IS the Christ) be, or can be the *Christ*, *the Light*, *or a part of that Light*, which at other times the *Quakers* say *is in every Man*? Or will they say, that *Christ's Flesh*, which he took of the *Seed* of *Abraham*, *is in every Man*, or is *it* another *Christ*? See their confusions and absurdities.

5. And

5. And when they say [*before Christ took Flesh*] let them deal plainly with us, and tell us WHEN *Christ* FIRST took *Flesh*, and whether they do not Believe he took *Flesh* BEFORE he was *Conceived* and *Born* of the Virgin *Mary*? and what *plain* Scripture they have that *saith so*?

And if *Christ* took *Flesh* BEFORE, whether it was *Real* Flesh, and what sort, and whether his *Flesh* that was born of the *Virgin* Mary *was the same*, or had *Christ at the time of his Birth, two different sorts of Flesh, not Figuratively, but Really and Properly so called*? and all this will shew their *Confusion*, and the *Ridiculousness* of their *Fancies*; for by *I. Pennington's* Question *p.* 20. it seems the *Quakers* do hold, *that* CHRIST's OWN FLESH, BLOOD AND BONES *are of an* ETERNAL NATURE; *And that the* FLESH AND BLOOD *which Christ took of* OUR NATURE *was only* OUR GARMENT, *and so of an* EARTHLY PERISHING NATURE.] And thus would make *Christ's Flesh Blood and Bones* to be GOD, for nothing can be of an *ETERNAL NATURE*, but GOD. *Monstrum Horrendum!* hear O *Heavens*! and hearken O *Earth*! What can be either *Confusion* or *Equivocation* in the World, (not to say *worse* of it) if this be not!

6thly. *G. W.* pag. 19. and in several other places, says, The *Quakers* must have not only *Plain* Scripture, but *Express* Scripture, *viz. Scripture that saith so*, or else they cannot admit it into their *Creed*.

So in *G. F.* and *T. Stubb's* Epistle before *G. W's* Book, intituled *The Divinity of Christ*: Their very first Words are, [Whether do the Scriptures speak

of three Persons in the God-head — in these express words? *Let us see where it is written, Come do not Shuffle, for we are resolved that the Scriptures shall buffet you about, and that you shall be whipped about with the Rule: Give us* Plain *Scripture for it* without adding, or diminishing, or shuffling. *We charge* you *Presbyterians, to give us* Printed Scriptures *for these following Words, and let us see in what Chapter and verse they are Printed,* viz. Concrete, Abstract, Relative, &c. *and so in this manner they are giving Names to* CHRIST *and God, besides the Rule of Scripture,* &c. And so they run on with it, over and over again.]

But now since they *Impose, Command,* and *Charge* others at this Rate, and not only so, but also *pretend* that they cannot admit of any thing in their *Creed,* but what they have plain and express Scripture *that saith so.* How *Reasonable* and *Just* is it to *Charge* them, and accordingly I do here *Charge* them, to produce where it is written in *Scripture* in these *express* words, [*The Divine Nature, or Word Cloathed with the most Holy Manhood, was and is the Christ,*] which they have admitted into their Creed: Let us see in what *Chapter and Verse* it is *Printed?* So *p.* 24. *The distinction of Father and Son, is Real in the Divine Relation, known as Co-workers in the Order and Degrees:*] Where's *Chap. and Verse for these words?*

Come *G. W.* Come (Quakers) shew me, or any other, the Chapter and Verse, where these words are written, [*viz.* Manhood, entire Manhood, the most Holy Manhood, Divine Relations, Co-workers in the Order and Degrees?] Or henceforward be *ashamed* of your *silly* doings, and such ridiculous scribling:

scribbling: I might think *W. P.* may yet have so much *Ingenuity* left in him, as that he would be *ashamed* of it when I consider his *Learning*; but that his undertaking to vindicate *G. F.* for notorious *falshoods* and *nonsence* (evident to mens Eyes and *Senses* and) against his *own senses* and ocular demonstration, makes me much to doubt it; see *Contr.* ended, *p.* 39. being sorry to see that so *ingenuous* a Man, as *W. P.* once was, should Sacrifice his own Senses, Reason, Honour and Reputation, to keep up the *Credit* of such a Man as G. *F.* who hath written in many things so *ridiculously* (that it's impossible for any Man to *vindicate* him, without making himself more ridiculous) and by his Tautologies and incoherency a sober Man would take him to be Craz'd: witness his *Professors Catechism, Testimony of the True Light*, and his *Primmer for the Scholars and Doctors of Europe.*

And which is yet more, G. I have this to add, That I do not think, *Thou*, nor all the Quakers in *England*, can bring *Express Scripture* for that which is your *First* and Grand Principle of all; which you talk of so much above all, *viz.* The Light of Christ within every Man, or Christ the Light within every Man] Now to speak in *G. F.* and *J. Stubb's* words, *I charge you* (Quakers) *Let us see where the Scripture speaks thus*, in these express words; *Let us see where it is written, come do not Shuffle, for we are resolved that the Scriptures shall buffet you* (Quakers) about, *and that you shall be* whipped *about with the Rule. Give us plain Scripture for it without* shuffling, adding or diminishing: *I charge you* (QUAKERS) *to give us* Printed Scriptures *for all these foregoing words, and let us see in what Chapter*

and Verſe they are Printed:] and if they do that, I think I may promiſe them to turn *Quaker* preſently.

But beſides this, their *Hypocriſie* herein is more groſs; For to what end (except to *deceive*) ſhould they pretend that they cannot own this or that *in their Creed*, if it be not *expreſſed in plain Scripture*, when they have ſo often, and ſo plainly avowed, *That the Scripture is not their Rule, either for Faith or Practice?* But now for the Proteſtants to call for *plain-Scripture* is but according to their *Principle*, becauſe they own it for their *Rule*.

7. So again, *p.* 19. *G. W.* confeſſes that JESUS CHRIST is MAN: one at firſt view might think he ſpoke well, ſo he does, if he did but mean *truly* what he *ſpeaks*; But that you may plainly ſee he doth not, and may ſee *what kind of* Man he means, in the ſame Page he gives you to underſtand, that it is ſuch a Man as hath not *HUMANE NATURE*, and *p.* 24. *ſuch a Man as is not a* Perſon without us: and what *kind of Man* think you muſt or can this be? Is not this a fine Quibble Judg you? That this their *Equivocation* may appear more plain, even to the *Capacity* of the *Vulgar*, conſider, That when the *Quakers* ſay, that Jeſus Chriſt is Man, They muſt mean either *That he is truly and ſubſtantially a Man*, a created Body and Soul, or *that he is an* Imaginary and Fictitious one only.

If the firſt, then they muſt own he is a diſtinct *Perſon*, & hath (as eſſential to him) *Humane Nature*, For to be a Man, is to have the Nature of Man, and every ſubſtantial Man is a *diſtinct* Perſon. But this they deny of *Chriſt*, & therefore they do not mean he is *ſuch* a Man. If the other, *viz.* an Imaginary or Fictitious Man, let them ſay ſo if they dare, and conſider how *Blaſphe-*

mous

mous it would be, and what *horrible* Conſequences would follow thereon: And therefore to go round again (let the *Quakers* equivocate as much as they will) they muſt hold *that indeed Chriſt is not Man*, or elſe fall into the BLASPHEMY or *Abſurdity* abovementioned. In plainneſs *G.* is *Jeſus Chriſt a Man* and not a Perſon? Seeing thou doſt define a Perſon to be a MAN, *&c.* In the Introduction of thy Book intituled the *Divinity of Chriſt*. What meaneſt thou by the word MAN? A *Created Body and Soul*, or ſome uncreated thing? Now *G.* uſe plainneſs and honeſty in this particular if there be any in thee: or whoever he be that undertakes to Anſwer for thee. Generally all Men in the World, that uſe the Term Man as properly an Engliſh word, underſtand by it, a PERSON, or a RATIONAL *CREATURE* diſtinct from all other Men, *one that is in ſome certain Place, and cannot be in diſtinct Places at the ſame time, that hath in reſpect of his Body, Dimenſions of Length Breadth, and Depth, that is viſible, one that began to exiſt at a certain time, one that hath a head and a body ſo cloſely united, that when-ever they two are ſevered, the Man ceaſes to be*; But the *Quakers*, they ſeem to mean quite another thing by the term MAN: ſometimes one thing, and ſometimes another; I believe themſelves know not well what. *By the term* MAN, *Do you not mean one that is not a Perſon or Rational Creature, but Fleſh, Blood, and Bones of an eternal Nature.* (J. P's. *Qu. p.* 20.) *an infinite Soul? One whoſe Fleſh is, and he is in a multitude of Men and Women in diſtant Countreys at the ſame inſtant of time?* Myſt. p. 68. Chriſt aſcend *p.* 18. *One that is not in Heaven, as a place to live in remote from Men that live on Earth?* Spir. of Truth *p.* 12. Chriſt

aſcen. p. 21. *one that is not* VISIBLE? Chriſt aſcend. p. 37. *one that began not to be, for he was eternal? one that is as far remote from his Body, as Heaven is from Earth, and yet lives?* See Quak. Plainneſs, p. 23. In *fine* it ſeems Jeſus Chriſt is a Man *whoſe Glorious Body in Heaven is not a Humane* [or Man's] *Body*, ſee the ſame p. 23. and doth not the *Quaker* uſe now admirable *Plainneſs* in his *Confeſſion* of *Faith* in *Scripture-Language*? Doth Europe or America afford ſuch *Equivocation*?

8. *G. W.* p. 19. ſays further, *That Chriſt's Body of Fleſh and Blood, that was born of the* VIRGIN-MARY, *and that ſuffered, was Crucifyed, Dyed*, and Roſe again the third day, is called the Body of Jeſus. But yet *G.* thou wilt not ſay, nor own, That that Living Body is Jeſus; or that BODY is ſo much as a part of Jeſus. Conſider this, ſerious Reader, here's ſtill the *Quakers Quibble*, and a clear proof of the *Quakers Myſtery*, whereby their poor unwary *Hearers* are *deluded* and *deceived*.

So they will ſay, the ſeventh day of the week *called* Saturday, and the eleventh Month *called* January, and the Scripture called the word of God, and the Writing or Declaration of Matthew *called* the Goſpel of St. *Matthew*, and abundance the like.

Which yet they do not one whit the more *Believe* it for *Truth*, for ſaying *it is called ſo*; But *Believe* quite the *Contrary*, as they believe the *Scripture* is not the Word of God, though it may be *called* ſo: ſo they can ſay (by their Equivocation) The Body that was born of the Virgin *Mary*, is called in Scripture, the Body of Jeſus, and yet will not own *that Body*, either to be a *part of Jeſus*; or do believe *it to be that Jeſus*

which

which the Scripture calls it. And here I appeal to all ſober and underſtanding People in *England* to Judg, if ever they heard ſuch Quibbling before (as the *Quakers* here uſe) about CHRIST *JESUS*: and this they are conſtrained to do, To maintain that *firſt* Principle they have took up, The Light within; for if they ſhould own that living Body of Fleſh and Blood that was *born of the Virgin* Mary *and that was Crucified and dyed, to be JESUS and the* CHRIST, then they foreſee, they ſhould confound, that their Beloved *Principle, The Light within every Man.* For how can *that Man or Body* of Fleſh Bone, and Blood, that was born of the Virgin *Mary, be in every Man*; and alſo upon this Ground, *They deny that Perſon, that Man that* was *born of the* Virgin Mary *to be the* Chriſt; Becauſe they cannot tell how to make *that very Perſon and Man to be in every Man, and in all Perſons*, and ſo rather than forego their Principle of the *Light within*, They will adventure to faſhion and form to themſelves, *a new Jeſus* and a *New Chriſt*, and have hid it and kept it as much as they could in a *Myſtery*, and in *Dark* ſayings, as long as they might, till at laſt being preſſed by many *Conteſts* and *Diſputes* they have been forced to diſcover it.

And now, Dear Friends and Countrey-Men, give me leave to tell you that though I do not remember that I ever poſitively ſaid, *That the Quakers were no Chriſtians*, yet I have much and often doubted in my ſelf, and do ſtill, *whether they can (according to their Principles)* be true Chriſtians: ſince they do not own nor believe *that Man*, nor *that living Body* that was *born* of the Virgin *Mary to be* the Jeſus and the Chriſt, and ſo do not believe, *that the* Chriſt indeed

dyed, and if Christ did not indeed Dy, *he did not* indeed rise again. Nay though they own that the Scriptures call that living *Body*, *Christ* and *Jesus*, yet they give us at the same time to understand, They do not Believe nor own it to be what they themselves say the Scripture calls it, and *so set up another Christ*, than what the Scripture *call's Christ*, and *declares* to us to be the true Christ, and Messiah of the World. And for this Reason, and out of this *Godly-Jealousy* and *Fear*, (and not out of *Envy* and wicked *malice* as they pretend) it is, that I cannot *own* them, but have thus *opposed* them: And let all People consider it, weigh it well, and take heed; It is not for nothing, or yet a slight matter only, that I set forth their Quibbles; But for their setting up another Christ, or another kind of Christ, than the Scripture holds forth and calls the Christ, to wit, *that Person*, *Man*, *or living Body*, *that* was *born* of the *Virgin* MARY: and what can be of a *higher* Nature or more dangerous in the *Christian* Religion, than for any to *set up any other Christ*, *or any other Person or thing for Christ*?

9. What plainer words is it possible to invent, that are *intelligible* to *Mankind*, than are used about this matter in *Scripture*, if Men would not be wilfully Blind as to give you an Instance or two, *Acts* 2. 22, 23. *Ye Men of Israel hear these words*, Jesus of Nazareth, A Man, *approved of God among you*, by *Miracles and Wonders and Signs*, *which God did by him in the midst of you*, *as ye your selves also know*, *HIM*, *being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledg of God*, *ye have taken and by wicked hands* have *Crucified* and *Slain*, *v.* 36. *Let all the House of Israel know* assuredly, *That God hath made*

that

that ſame Jeſus *whom ye have Crucifyed both* LORD and Chriſt obſerve the Apoſtle ſays, that ſame Jeſus, *viz.* Jeſus of Nazareth A Man, *God* hath made both Lord and Chriſt, and if that ſame, then no other: and again, *that* ſame Jeſus, whom the Men of *Iſrael* had taken, and by wicked hands did Crucify and Slay! That ſame Jeſus, (*and not any thing elſe*) *hath God made both* Lord and Chriſt: Now, it was not the *Light within*, that the Men of *Iſrael* took, and by *wicked hands Crucified, Hang'd on a Tree and Slew*; But it was *that Man, that Perſon, that Body* that was *born* of the *Virgin Mary, Jeſus of Nazareth*, that the *Jews* took, and by *wicked hands Crucified* and *Hang'd on a Tree*. So it appears as plain (as any thing in the World can be by words made Plain) that that *ſame Man, that Body*, or *that Perſon* which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, Jeſus of Nazareth is *he* which *God* hath *made* both LORD and CHRIST and *not the Light within every Man, nor any other thing.*

Luke 24. 39. *Behold my Hands and my Feet*, that it is I my ſelf; *handle me and ſee, For a* Spirit *hath not* Fleſh *and* Bones, as ye ſee me have, *and when he had thus ſpoken, he ſhewed them his hands and his feet.* John 20. 24, 25. *But* Thomas *one of the twelve called* Dydimus *was not with them when Jeſus came, The other Diſciples therefore ſaid unto him, we have ſeen the Lord: but he ſaid unto them, Except I ſhall ſee in his hands the Print of the Nails, and put my finger into the Print of the Nails, and thruſt my hand into his ſide, I will not believe.* v. 26, 27, 28. *And after eight days, again his Diſciples were within, and* Thomas *with them: Then came Jeſus, the door being ſhut, and ſtood in the midſt, and ſaid, Peace be*

unto

unto you. *Then saith he to* Thomas, *reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing. And* Thomas *answered, and said unto him, my Lord, and my God*, v. 31. *But these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the* Christ *the* Son of God, *and that believing ye might have Life through his Name.* What *Jesus? even* That *Jesus, that same Person* that was not *within* but *without Thomas*, who had the Print of *material nails* in his *hands*, that *Thomas* put his finger in, is the Christ the Son of God.

Now, *G. W.* Answer me in plainness once, if thou wilt be so honest, *Was this Jesus* (that the Apostle says here, we are to believe *is* the *Christ* the Son of God,) *without Thomas, then when he put his finger into the Print of the Nails?* Or was it only Acted *within Thomas* his Body? And hath the Light within (which thou owneſt *for thy Jesus*) any *Print* of *Material Nails* or *hands, properly* so called, of flesh and bone, as *this* Jesus had which is the *true* CHRIST? see also *Math*, 1. 1. with *verse* 16. and *Heb.* 2. 14.

10. *G. W. p.* 20. takes notice of *Jer. Ives* great Question, as he calls it, *Whether Christ's Humane Nature was a part of Christ?* But he gives no Answer to it, but gives it the *go-by*, by saying it was not a Question in Scripture-*Phrase*: But that could be no good Answer from thee, because thou thy self dost, and hast asked many Questions which are not in Scripture-Phrase: and besides, that can be but a silly pretence no better than a Shuffle *from thee*, because thou dost not *own* the *Scripture*, or *Scripture-Phrase* to be the *Rule* of thy *Faith*: Therefore Quibble no more about it, but Answer it.

11. Then *p.* 21, 22, 23. G. *W.* instead of Answering

swering my *Epistle*, as he pretends in his Title, puts many new *Questions* to the *Baptists*, and prays them to agree upon a consistent *Creed* amongst themselves, and so *slily* gives me the *go-by*, to which I need only say this, That I am of the Opinion, it may be as easy for the *Baptists* to form a *Creed* wherein they are all agreed, as it is for the *Quakers* to Form a *Creed* wherein they & their writings do all agree: Let the *Quakers* do this themselves which they require of others.

Further, I dare adventure to say, that let *a Baptist* or some other Person, give but three Texts of Scripture to be interpreted, or put but three Questions to six Quakers, all apart, and let them answer apart, and that there shall not three of the six *Quakers* alike, give the *same Answer* or *Interpretation* thereto, either in form or substance, notwithstanding their pretended inspiration and *unity*.

12. *Pag.* 23. *G. W.* says, That *though the meer Body of Jesus, was not the* ENTIRE *Christ, yet the Name Christ is sometimes given to the Body, though not so properly, as to the whole Man Christ.*]

Reply. But thou wilt not own *that the meer Body was part of Christ*; so far art thou from owning it to be the *entire* Christ, and though they acknowledg the Scripture calls the Body Christ, yet they are so obstinate in their own conceits, that they will not believe it is what the Scripture calls it, but thus will be *wise* above what's *written*. Oh deceit! you think the *Body* so far from being the *entire Christ*, that you will not allow it to be *any part of him*, but such as a Garment is *that is none at all*.

13. *Pag.* 23, 24. *G. W.* says, That the Distinction *of Father* and Son, is not only Nominal, but Real, *&c.*] How then doth *G. F.* say, Myst. *p.* 142.

142. *Christ is not distinct from the Father*, and that they are all one, *p.* 99? will *G.* W. and the Quakers Condemn those sayings and disclaim them? till then they are *Quibblers* and *Equivocators*. *G. W. p.* 24. *and also known as* Co-workers in the order and degrees of Manifestation and discovery. And yet *G. W.* himself when he writ against a *Baptist*, for saying [*now as he was God, he was* Co-Creator *with the Father*] Then he condemned it as *nonsence*, saying, *What nonsence and* UNSCRIPTURAL-*LANGUAGE, is this, to tell of* God *being* Co-CREATOR *with the* Father, *or that* God had Glory with God? DOES NOT THIS IMPLY TWO GODS, AND THAT GOD HAD A FATHER? says *G. W.* The Light and Life, *&c. p.* 47.] Oh excellent *George!* what difference between Co-Workers, and Co-Creators? Do ye not most frequently and importunely charge your *Socinians* with the horrible Crime of denying that *Jesus Christ* made or created the World? And yet is there any *Socinian*, nay *Jew*, or *Turk*, that will deny that *one God* (whom we call the *Father of Jesus Christ*) made the World? And thou sayest it's nonsence *to tell of* God [or Christ as God] being Co-Creator *with the Father*: oh disingenuous Man, that endeavours to get repute to your selves by *Reviling* others with that very thing whereof your selves are guilty! And the ground of your *Reproach* is, that you can *equivocate*, and they cannot.

14. *G. W. p.* 24. says, *That the* Distinction *of Father and Son is not only nominal but* real.

Now then let him if he can answer and confute his *sincere-hearted* and *Zealous* Brother *W. P.* in his *Sandy-Foundation*, *p.* 13.

Mr.

'Mr. *Pen's* Argument is this, *Since the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Spirit is God (which their Opinion neceſſitates them to confeſs)* THEN 'UNLESS *the* Father, Son, and Spirit ARE THREE DISTINCT NOTHINGS, *they muſt be* THREE DISTINCT SUBSTANCES, and *Conſe-'quently* THREE DISTINCT GODS.] Now *G.* if this *Diſtinction* of thine, does not make them DISTINCT SUBSTANCES, thy Brother *Penn* tells thee they are DISTINCT NOTHINGS. Reconcile this if thou canſt, and agree amongſt your ſelves upon a *Creed* before you go about to *Correct* others.

15. *G. W. p.* 24. further ſays, *We own that the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, as alſo that the SON IS THE MIGHTY GOD, THE EVERLASTING FATHER, the Prince of Peace. But they do not own any ſuch ſeparation between* God *and* Chriſt *as theſe words* [*the Chriſt of himſelf and the God of himſelf*] *do imply Socinian-like*] For this, let his Brother *W. P. Socinian-like* Anſwer him, and ſee what he makes of *ſuch* Doctrine as G. *W.* here teaches, and let G. *W. refute* his Brother *Penn's* Argument. *Sandy Foundation p.* 14. he proves the Ridiculouſneſs and irrationality 'of ſuch an *Opi-nion*, by this *Argument*, *viz. If that the* ONLY 'God is the FATHER, and CHRIST be that ONLY God, then is CHRIST the FATHER: 'So *if that* ONE GOD *be the* SON: *and the Spi-'rit that one God, then is the Spirit the SON, and ſo 'round, nor is it poſſible to ſtop ſays he.* And this he brings many *Arguments* to prove to be both an *irra-tional* and a *Ridiculous Opinion*, and yet now is this the very Opinion of G. W. and other *Quakers*, viz. That Chriſt, or the Son, is the Father, as you

ſee

see G. *W*'s words above do confess. Now let us know which of these two Brethren the *Quakers* will own to be wrong: For according to these words it is impossible they can be both *right*: and let us know in *Plainness* (if there be any such thing now left among the *Quakers*) whether *W. P.* will *own* his own Argument, or whether thou *G. W.* wilt *disclaim* him or it, or thy *own* words; For they are as *contrary* as *Yea, and Nay.*

16. *G. W. p.* 24. Confesses, *that the Title of* Person without us, *is* un-scriptural, *and* too low *to give to the* CHRIST [or the Son], and yet his Brother *W.* P. in his Sandy Foundation *p.* 15. could give the Title of Person to Christ or the Son: these are his words, *Who* (speaking of the SON) *so many hundred years since in* PERSON *testified the Virtue of it.* Now then G. thou must say Christ is a Person within us, or else *disclaim* and *disown* W. P. for giving such an *unscriptual* and *too low a Title*, to Christ the Son; if not, dost thou not *dissemble*? and did not *W. P.* speak of a Person without us, as his words [*who so many hundred years since testified*] do evince plainly enough?

17. The *Quakers* being charged, that according to their Principle, *They cannot and do not Believe that* CHRIST INDEED DYED; G. *W.* does not *deny* it, but asks the *Baptists*, *If any more of Christ properly dyed than the Body? Do you hold that his Soul Spirit or Divinity dyed? If not, the Charge is foolish and silly.*

Reply. No *G.* the *Charge* is not *foolish* nor *silly*; for as I understand the *Baptists* hold that the *living Body that was born of the Virgin Mary is* Christ, *and that that dyed, and so believe that* Christ *indeed* dyed: But you

you *Quakers* not Believing ſo, *if you Believe that indeed the Chriſt dyed, you muſt Believe his Spirit or his Divinity Dyed*, for that only you hold is THE CHRIST, *and then are you like* Reeve and Muggleton *who have* Blaſphemouſly *ſaid that the* Godhead dyed, and thus is thy *Charge* turn'd upon thy *own* head; and thy *Queſt.* proves *fooliſh* and *filly*, For how canſt thou ask if any *more* of *Chriſt* than the *Body* dyed, when thou doſt not Believe *the Body to be Chriſt, or any* real *or* eſſential PART OF CHRIST: *Thus whilſt you own the Body not to be the Chriſt, nor a real part of the Chriſt, you muſt own that not the* Chriſt *nor* any real part of Chriſt *dyed; ſince you agree, only the Body dyed, and the Body of Jeſus was not the Chriſt, ſay you, nor any eſſential real part of Chriſt, that you will own.*

18. As to *Jer. Ives* Anſwer to their *Diſtinction*, it ſeemed to me *pertinent* enough to manifeſt their *fallacy* and *folly*; and ſo it doth ſtill for ought *G. W.* hath told me as yet to the contrary; and I cannot without offering *violence* to my *underſtanding* be ſo much taken with *G's Reply* which is on this wiſe *p.* 26. *It's not improbable, that if we had made ſuch a compariſon, you Baptiſts would have cryed out, oh* Blaſphemy!

This is an *improbable* or an *improper* Reply indeed; It's more *probable* W. P. could have told G. W. (if he did not know it) that he had learnt in the Schools, that *may-bee's*, can be anſwered with *may not bee's*, and ſo *this* might be ſufficient for *that*: But,

1. What if the *Baptiſts* would not in ſuch a caſe, have Cryed out, *Oh* Blaſphemy! where's thy Anſwer then *George?*

2. Or, what if the *Baptiſts* ſhould, and the *Quakers* ſhould not, in ſuch a Caſe, *Cry out oh* Blaſphemy!

my! as thou doſt not affirm it is *Blaſphemy*; where's thy Anſwer then *George*?

3. Or, what if there be no ſuch *compariſon* made as thou pretendeſt is implyed, (as ſure I am there is not) *viz.* the *name* of *Chriſt*, to be *no more excellent* than the *name* of *George* or *William*? Where's then thy Anſwer *George*? And where's now thy *oh Ignorance* in the *Abſtract*? one may well enough ſee it in the *Concrete*, *viz.* in G. W. when thou ſetteſt down thy *Reply*, thou, immediately ſays *oh Ignorance in the Abſtract!* now, if thou meaneſt (as it may be ſo taken) that the words of thy *Reply is* ſuch, I ſhall not trouble my ſelf to ſay much againſt it; But if thou *ſpeakeſt* it of *me* or the *Baptiſts*, by thy uſing that word *Abſtract*, thou ſheweſt thy own *Ignorance* and want of *Learning* (not well underſtanding the word *Abſtract*,) which againſt the next time thou writeſt for *W.* P he may inform thee, and teach thee ſo much *Logick*; Ignorance in the Abſtract *Qualitatem notat nulli ſubjecto inhærentem*, and *ſo* not in *me*; Ask thy Brother P. elſe: Beſides, how thou wilt *Anſwer* for this word *Abſtract* before your *Prophet* G. F. I know not, for in the Epiſtle before one of thy own Books (*Divin. of Chriſt*:) he condemns *that* word, as well as others, as coming from our old *Logical and Philoſophical Books*, and yet behold here a *Quaker* uſes it, oh what *ſelf-contradicting* and *diſſembling* Men are they!

And as for the *excellency* thou now pretendeſt to own, *in the name of Chriſt*, one may ſee it to be but *Hypocriſy* uſed for *evaſion-ſake* only, by what your friend *John Crook* ſays of the *name Chriſt and Jeſus*. Principles of Truth *p.* 12.

With-

[*Without this Vertue*, [*viz. The Arm of God*] CHRIST and JESUS *are but* empty names. *We believe and know, by his Grace in our hearts, that as his name* JESUS *without Vertue and Power, is but an* empty word, &c *p.* 11. *But the name which* saves, *is the* power *and* arm *of God, that brings Salvation from Sin*, &c.] Pray how much more *excellent* does the *Quaker* here make the *name JESUS*, than the *name* GEORGE or WILLIAM? Are they? Can they be less *excellent* than *empty* words? Oh the *Hypocrisy* of these Men! to say no worse.

19. I said the *Quakers* Quibbled as much about the word Body as the word Christ, and G. W. instead of *denying* it, hath *confirmed* it, *p.* 29. For though it be Scripture-*Language, That the Body is* one *and hath many Members*, and in another place, *That the Church of Christ is his Body*: yet it will not therefore follow, nor is it according to Scripture-*Language, That Christ had* NO OTHER Body *than his* Church, for had he not a Body, that was born of the Virgin MARY? or was the Church *viz.* all the Saints in the World born of the Virgin Mary? *Or had the Body of Christ that was born of the Virgin Mary* (the espoused Wife of *Joseph*) *no other members* (*as Arms, Hands, Legs*, &c.) *but only the Saints?* would not this be rare *Divinity!* When Thomas put his *finger* into the Print of the *nails* in the *hands* of *Jesus*, and put his *hand* into his *side*, was that then the *Church*, that *Thomas* put his *hand* and *finger* into? Oh excellent Quakerism!

Pag. 30. G. W. would slily give the *go-by*, to my discourse about Mr. *Keith's* distinction, of making three Christs, by taking no notice upon what I grounded the *Objection*, *viz.* Now *after this rate*, or

by the same manner of Reasoning and Quibbling, may not one say that G. K. *makes three Christs in Scripture, and that with* as much Truth *as for any of them to affirm Christ would be a* Monster, *by saying he hath* two Bodies? But this he slides by, not Answering a word to it: Is this the Quakers plainness? Is it not indeed a plain shuffle? But come *George*: come back again, take notice what it is thou hast to *Answer*, and then *Answer* it, *Shuffle* me no *Shuffles*, nor *Quibble* me no more such *Quibbles*: neither doth G. tell me (which I also prayed *W.* P. honestly and plainly to do) whether G. K. meant,

- *That these three were three* Christs, *in three distinct Persons?*
- *Or that these three* [and not any thing less than these three] *were one* Christ, *in one distinct Person?*
- *Or whether these three are no* Christ *at all, in no distinct Person.*

Let G. W. Remember his *own* words in his *Introduction* to his *Divinity of* Christ [*We judg that such expressions and words as the* Holy Ghost *taught the* true Apostles *and holy men mentioned in Scripture, are most meet to speak of* God *and* Christ, *and not the words of* man's wisdom, *or* humane Inventions, *and* devised Distinctions *since the Apostles days*] —— *nor in Philosophical* terms *and nice* School-*Distinctions derived from* heathenish Seraphistick[a],] and now tell me G. whether this of thy Brother *Keiths*, is not a devised Distinction *since the* Apostles? And whether G. thou hast not *condemned* thy Brother *K*'s *Distinction*? Where is there such an expression in the *Scripture*, as Proper, least Proper, *&c.* are not these Philosophical Terms?

SECT.

Sect. III.

In Reply to his third Section shewing G. W's *and the* **Quakers Ignorance**, *of the true* **Spirits Evidence**, *who deny the* **Gift of Tongues, Prophecy, Signs,** *&c. to be such.*

1. IN my Epistle to *W. P. p.* 8. I minded him of the Apostle *Paul's* words, 2 *Cor.* 12. 12, 13. Truly the SIGNS of an Apostle were wrought AMONG YOU in all Patience in SIGNS and WONDERS and MIGHTY DEEDS. For what is it wherein ye were INFERIOR to other Churches?

Here was a Church *indeed* that had the Spirits evidence, and here was an Apostle *indeed* that had *Divine Revelation*, the Gift *of Prophecying* & *Tongues*, and *Interpretation* of Scripture: such an Apostle was one, who indeed was not of Men, neither by Man, but sent by *Jesus Christ*, and God the *Father*, who raised him from the dead, *Gal.* 1. 1. But no such Apostles nor Friends of the Ministry can I find amongst the Quakers, who yet pretend to be *Apostles*, not *of Men*, nor *by Man*, but immediately sent by *God*, and pretend to have the *same Spirit*, *Calling and Power* that the Apostle *Paul* had. And yet alas do

not EVIDENCE it any MORE than OTHERS do, who pretend to it, with as much *Confidence* as themselves: Nay, and so far are they from that, that I do not see they are able to produce any MORE or give any better Demonstration of it, than those *who do not pretend* at all immediately to it: and therefore I told *W. P.* if he had had the GIFT OF TONGUES given him by the SPIRIT IMMEDIATELY upon his turning QUAKER: Or if he could shew but ONE in all his Church, that had such a *spiritual Gift* or Gifts upon his Conversion to their way, it would put a clear difference betwixt *them* and the *Baptists* Churches; and herein would the *Quakers* plainly then exceed and excel them: and that one such Testimony (if true) in the *Quakers* Church would more *confute* the *Anabaptists* and *Convince* their *Auditors*, than a hundred such days brawling disputes, where the Quakers shew'd no more POWER OF THE SPIRIT than their Adversaries; only *fenced* with *words* as well as they could, as their wits would serve them best to *Distinguish*, *Evade*, or *Answer*. And therefore I told *W. P.* I found his *Church* as *Poor* and *Low* as the *Baptists* whom yet they *condemned*. I finding he had the words of Man's *Wisdom* in making plausible *Orations*, but askt him, *Where was the Demonstration of the Spirit in Power and Sign?* 1 Cor. 2. 4, 5.

2. Now at this I find *George* is put to a great loss, saying *p.* 14. *What if God will not bestow such* Gifts and Signs now? Being afraid to say, *God will*, and yet not daring to say, *God will not*, what *George*, art thou in a *Maze*? Is not this *Scripture-Phrase*? Is not this according to Scripture-Language, 1 *Cor.* 4. 19, 20. *I will know, not the* Speech of them that are puffed up, but the Power; *For the Kingdom of God*

is

is not in Word *but in* Power; see also *Revel.* 2. 2. And is not this according to your *own* Language, *G. Foxes* Epistle before thy Book *Divin. of Christ*, *have you the same* Power and Spirit, *that gave forth the* Scriptures? And such miraculous Gifts are no more than what we find testifyed to have been and remained in the Christian-Church about two hundred or three hundred years after *Christ. Irenæus* who lived one hundred and eighty years after Christ, affirmeth *that in his time the working of* Miracles, *the* Raising *of the Dead, the casting out of* Devils, *healing of the* sick *by* laying on of hands, and Prophesying, *were in being; and that some that were so raised from the dead, remained among them alive long after, Niceph. Eccles. Hist.* Tom. 1. lib. 4. cap. 13. *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* (which last lived till above 250 years after Christ) *do both make mention of the ordinary casting out of* Devils, *and challenged the* Heathen *to come and see it.*

3. But says he *p.* 31. *this is very strange*, But what then *George*? It is not more *strange* than *true*? And I say, Is it not *very* strange, that you will pretend to the *Power* and the *Spirit*, and talk of being *sent immediately by God*, as *Paul was*, and *have a Divine Commission* to Prophesie, and yet cannot bring any Evidence to prove it more than *Others*? And instead of Producing one such Apostle, Prophet or Minister in thy Church, the best thing (which yet alas is bad enough) thou canst say for thy self, *Oh! our opposers do argue as just like the* Papists and *Jesuites, as if they had served seven years at Rome.*

Reply. Ah *Quibbler!* this will not serve thy turn above all Persons, for who Argues more like a Papist or Jesuite than your selves about *proving the* Scrip-

tures *not to be the* Rule *of your Faith?* Who uſes the *Jeſuites* Arguments to prove *good works the meritorious cauſe of our* Juſtification more than you?

Was it not one of the moſt eminent and learnedſt Men that ever you had amongſt you, that poſitively aſſerts THE SCRIPTURE TO BE A NOSE OF WAX, *yea, and ſays it is* CAPABLE *of being* NO OTHER? *Sam. Fiſher Additional Appendix, p.* 21. And is not this the Jeſuites Phraſe *in terminis*? And none but Papiſts (except your ſelves) uſe it, *Andrad. Orth. Explic. lib.* 2. *p.* 104. What had *S. Fiſher* ſerved ſeven years at *Rome*? Nay, I can ſhew you and others may ſee if they mind it, that almoſt all the Arguments that *Mr. Fiſher* uſes to prove *the Scripture is not the Rule of Faith*, are the very ſame that the *Papiſts* and *Jeſuites* have uſed theſe hundred years; and ſo *G. F.* in the Epiſtle before thy ſaid Book, ſays, where doth the Scripture ſay *that it ſelf is the Word of God?* Juſt ſo do the Papiſts Argue. What now *George*? Is the Argument the *better* or the *worſe*, becauſe the Jeſuites have uſed it? Doſt thou think in thy *Conſcience* this is a *good* Anſwer? You can ſometimes tell us that the *Papiſts* may uſe good Arguments, and ſo the *Jeſuites* make uſe of the *Scriptures*, yet never the worſe for that; nay do but ſee how thou haſt Anſwered this matter thy ſelf, in thy own Book, *Divin. of Chriſt, p.* 38. It is but a mean way of Arguing *to accuſe or miſcal any for owning any Truth, that any ſort (if they do err in ſome things) do hold; for by that way, I may as well be reckoned a* Papiſt, *a* Jew, *or a* Turk, *&c.*]

How now *George*, and yet doſt thou uſe this mean way of Arguing againſt me? For *ſhame* do not *forget* thy ſelf and *ſhuffle* backwards and forwards thus,

thus, but use some *Conscience* in thy *Scribling*! if thou hast any *tenderness* and *plainness* in thee, lay thy hand upon thy Mouth.

4. But further I'le tell thee, that I have oft used this *Argument* against the **Papists**, and to chuse, would use it before any other; and the first and best thing (as I verily think) that I could use, if I was to Dispute with a **Jesuite**, should be to put him *to the* **Proof of his Church**, and its **Infallibility**; That's their first *Principle* and their *Foundation*, and without doubt any person that will make Tryal, shall find it best there to begin with them; and it is but *equitable*, *just*, and *reasonable*, that if they say or propose their *Church* to be *infallible* and *the only true Church*, that they should first prove it to be so; and there would I begin with a *Quaker*, it being both necessary and reasonable. Wherefore this is so far from being *only* a *Jesuite's* Argument, that I am of the Opinion, there can be *no better way* of Arguing against *them*: I need no better *Authority*, than the Example of worthy Mr. *Chillingworth*, and I would advise all people to go that way to work with the *Quakers*, their *main Principles* being easily reduced in effect to those of the *Church* of **Rome**, and those *Arguments* that prove *effectual* against one, may as effectually serve against the other. Take but THEIR LIGHT WITHIN for the POPE, and their INFALLIBILITY (which now of late is run out of *particular* persons into that) OF THE BODY, for the CHURCH, and the business is done. For as the *Papists* calls it the CHURCH, so the Quakers now call their CHURCH the BODY, the BODY of Friends. So here's only the difference of *words*, and who-ever discreetly considers this, and makes use of it, will doubtless find

the ease and Benefit of it, in Disputing with a *Papist* or a *Quaker*: I have already shew'd it to be both necessary and equitable.

Now Reader, canst thou think this was a *good* or *sufficient* Answer from *G. W.* alas it is a sign he was *hard* put to it, that he could find no better *Evasion!*

5. Then he says *p.* 31, and 32. *the Baptists produce no such signs*, and I so told him before; that I found them both a like poor and low in this respect, (so far as I knew with certainty,) and hereby then he grants, that he stands upon *no better ground* than the Baptist-Churches, *why then will he condemn them*, since they have, if not *better*, yet as *good*, *demonstrations* as the *Quakers* for ought yet appears? But besides, the *Baptists* here have this to say for themselves, *they do not pretend to immediate Divine Revelations*, and *such inspirations*, *nor to a Gift of Infallibility*, *nor yet to any such immediate Commission from Heaven*, *as the Quakers do*, and therefore *no wonder* if they hold, there's no need of Miracles or Signs, to Evidence or *prove* that which they do not *pretend to*: Wherefore *George* is at a loss and *beside the business here* by thinking to Answer me, by *Quotations* out of the *Baptists* Books: for what's all this to the *Quakers*, *who do pretend to immediate Divine Revelations*, and *Inspirations as the Apostles had*, *to a gift of infallibility*, *and to an immediate Commission from Heaven*, *to go forth as Prophets*, *Apostles*, *&c*, What, because the *Baptists* that pretend *not* to this, need bring *no Miracles* to prove that which they lay *no Claim* to, must therefore the *Quakers* who do lay *Claim* to all this, be believed that they have it *without giving* us any *visible Evidence*, *Sign*, or *Demonstration* that they *so have* it *indeed*?

indeed? only their bare word, a very good one! as If I ſhould lay *Claim* to an *Eſtate*, and yet need bring no *more Evidence* to prove my *Title*, than all other Perſons that lay *no Claim*, nor *pretend to it* at *all*.

But yet this is not all; For I find there are three *ſorts of Perſons* now in the World, that do in a *more eminent* manner pretend a *Title*, and *lay all Claim to infallibility*, a *Divine Commiſſion*, *and a power or Gift of the Right Interpretation of Scripture*; *viz.*

The Papiſts (or the Church of *Rome*)
The Quakers (or their Friends of the Miniſtry, or Body)
The Muggletonians, (or their Prophet)

Here the *Quakers* have *two grand Competitors* which lay Claim to what they pretend to, How will they do here, TO EVINCE THAT THEY HAVE IT MORE THAN THE OTHER, the leaſt of which *viz.* Muggleton ſeems to ſtand upon *even* ground with the Quakers; but the Papiſts ſeem to have a *grand* advantage above them, for they produce a claim of above a *thouſand* years ſtanding, whereas the *Quaker's* is but an *Up-ſtart*: Beſides, they pretend to be in *poſſeſſion* of it, and how the *Quakers* will *diſpoſſeſs* them I cannot tell, ſince they have now left going to Rome, and *I hear no more of Divine Commiſſions they receive to convert the Pope of late years*. Now *George*, Thou hadſt dealt *honeſtly* and *plainly*, if thou hadſt told me *this*, and *this* is it which is both *Rational* and *neceſſary* if thou *expecteſt* or *claimeſt credence before them*; and this I expect of thee.

'*For it is not enough to ſay, Thou art in the Truth,* '*and they are in Error and Blaſphemy*; *for they ſay* '*that of thee*, and this I told *W. P.* that he knew

in

in his *Conscience was but a shameful begging of the Question*: *For why shouldst thou be believed on* THY BARE SAY-SO, *more than they*? And this is so honest *G.* that it is according to thy own arguing with me: *p.* 41. sayest thou, *as if they were all bound to believe his Accusations on his bare word*; so say I, are we all (or any) bound to believe thy *Pretensions*, and thy *Commission* from Heaven upon thy *bare word*, or if not upon thy *bare word*, *upon what then*? Answer this *George* plainly.

6. *Pag.* 32. *G.* would *mince* the matter if he could, saying, Now as we have not this way *imposed our Faith* upon our Opposers, so we shall not thus *impose* upon this *Man* or the *Baptists*. But *desire he and they may seek and* try further.

Reply. Thanks to thee for nothing *George*; Thou and thy Friends have been UNCHRISTIANING of of us these twenty years, and UNCHURCHING all the Churches in *England* and *Europe*, calling the Priests and Professors of all sorts, all the abominable names that you could invent; and now truly when you are questioned your selves, and find that notwithstanding all your *boasting pretences* and *Braggadocio's*, you can produce NO MORE than others, whom you have *condemned* and *unchristianed*, oh truely then thou sayest, *we shall not thus impose our Faith upon the Baptists, or this Man*: Pray tell us which way thou wilt impose it; *or what way dost thou propose for a Discrimination, and a Rule to try you by, since you have disowned the SCRIPTURES fit for that*? see S. Fisher, Addit. Append. p. 21. *which Transcriptions and Translations* WERE THEY NEVER SO CERTAIN and intire by Answering to the first Original Copies, *yet are not* CAPABLE (*to be to*

all Men) any other than a Lesbian Rule, *or* Mose of Wax, *&c.*

If you say the SPIRIT shall be the *Rule* to try you, The Papists and Muggleton say you have it not, but each of them are as certain as you they have it, therefore it will be absolutely requisite *for you to* Convince *and give some such* Demonstration *that you have the* Spirit, *which neither they nor others can give*, before you can be tryed by that; because that is the *question, whether you have the* SPIRIT *and the* POWER OF GOD *or no,* MORE *than others.*

7. And then let me tell *George:* That if he could *Demonstrate* it this way, it would not be, nay it could not be any *Imposing* upon me; if *G. W.* did *visibly Evidence* and *demonstrate to me, by Power and mighty Deeds, that he had indeed that Power and Spirit that he says he hath*: Therefore thou talkest *deceitfully* as if that would be an *Imposing*; But now *yours* is *imposing, when you condemn Men for not-believing* that you have *immediate Revelations*, or in that you assert and would have us believe, *you are* MORE *inspired than other Men, or other Societies and Bodies of Christians.* And you tell us you have the *Spirit* and are in the *Truth* MORE than others whom you Condemn as *false*, and yet you produce NOTHING except YOUR BARE SAY-SO, MORE than others, who SAY SO of *themselves as you do of your selves.* Now here's the IMPOSING; you pretend *you* are Infallible, and yet produce *no more or other effects of your* Infallibility, *than other* Men can or do: Nay on the contrary *the same effects of Fallibility are evident among you, as among others*; and yet if any deny it in you, you *Censure*

and

and Curse them for not *believing* you, and this is *your way of Imposing.*

And you *Quakers* say you are *immediately sent of God*, and *commissioned from* God to deliver such or such a *Message* or *Curse*, and that this, and that is *given forth by the Holy Ghost in you, or from the Spirit* : and yet you shew *no more certainty to prove to us, and for us infallibly to build our Faith on, that you are so sent*, and SO *Commissioned from God, than Muggleton does or other Churches, which yet your selves say,* ARE NOT SENT OF GOD *nor Commissioned by him.*

Now here's **imposing** upon Mens beliefs, and this I say you are *guilty* of, yea, and most eminently *guilty* of, next to **Muggleton** or the **Pope**, of any Person or People I know; and this is the thing *George*, thou shouldst have Answered, if thou hadst Answered me to the purpose and main bent of my *Epistle* to *W. P.* ; But this thou pittifully *evadest* and slily wouldst *slide* from.

But now, *since you pretend to such high things*, if you had the *visible Spiritual Gifts* that were amongst the true *Primitive* Churches and *Apostles* to *evidence* and *demonstrate* the *Truth* of what now you ONLY SAY *and pretend*, I should never (nor I suppose any Man in his wits) call or esteem it any *imposing* on my *Faith* : But the other is so indeed as I have shew'd you, and therefore *G.* I would take thee by the hand, and lead thee back again, praying thee not to *shuffle* and *Cut* also, but Answer *this*, and not that which I never desired of thee, nor *W. P.* That's the *very thing* I found fault with you before, *viz. That you would Answer to that which was not askt you, instead of returning Answer to that which was* ; and yet still thus

thus thou ſerveſt me, but it will not do. For my deſign is, that I may know you better, what **Real Power, Evidence** and **Authority** you have BEYOND others, that ſo I may have a good *Foundation* for my *Faith*, and give *Credit to it and you*: Or that for *want* of it, you may be brought to a better *ſight* of your ſelves, and ſee your *nakedneſs* and Poverty, (though you ſay (as the Church of *Laodicea*) that you are rich) and ſo may learn to be *humble*, and not *Cenſure others*, except you can *better* evidence your *own*.

9. And yet why wilt thou ſay, *you have not* **impoſed** *thus your Faith on others*? Was not, and hath not your Language been ſuch as this? *viz. It's true, that Timothy, Titus, and others*, WHO HAD GIFTS IN THEM *for the Miniſtry, were* **approved by** Paul *and others of the Primitive Elders for the work, but this is* **no Proof** *that theſe oppoſers, Miniſters, are either* **ſo gifted** *or* **approved**, *G. W. Enthuſiaſm above Atheiſm, p.* 5.] And ſo ſay I, neither is it *any Proof* that the QUAKERS MINISTERS are SO GIFTED or APPROVED; and the Words before-cited of *G. F.* before thy own Book: *Have you the* SAME POWER and SPIRIT *that gave forth the Scriptures*?

G. W. Wilt thou believe thy own words? Then ſee thy Anſwer to Mr. *Richard Baxters* two ſheets for the Miniſtry, *p.* 16. *He never underſtood that they that ſet up theſe Prieſts, were called as* Peter, *or* Paul, *or the Elders, who had* Power *to lay on the hands, that the* HOLY GHOST FELL ON THE PARTY ON WHOM THEY LAID ON THEIR HANDS] and ſhew me any ONE of thy MINISTERS CALLED SO *George*.

G.

G. F. To all People in all Christendom says thus, p. 2. *All Sects — have the* words *of the Apostles, but out of the* Power *and* Life.

A Paper sent forth into the World from the Quakers, p. 5. [We are against— the *Pastors* that NOW STEAL the words of the Prophets, of Christ and his Apostles] *W. P. Reason against Railing, p. 115. Many may run into the Practice of several outward things, mentioned in the Scriptures to have been the practice of Saints in former Ages, and yet not be led into the Truth, for* all *that is but* will-worship, Imitation, *and* unwarrantable.]

And all this I may say against you, which you have said against others, and if they were good then, why not still? For you have but the *Names* and *Images* of *things*, you have got the words used in *Scripture*, [the *Power*] and the [*Spirit*] [*the Gifts of the Spirit*,] *the Demonstration of the Spirit and Power*] But alas where is the thing it self, *viz. the visible* Power *and* Gifts *of the Spirit, the Demonstration of the Spirit that the true Apostles had*, and *the Scripture speaks of*? To this *George* can *poorly* say, what if God will not bestow such Gifts now? why then, *George*, I say thou hast them not, only hast stolen *the words* out of the Scriptures, thou hast got the *Name*, the *Image* and words, as thou sayest the *Baptists* and others have done: but alas, art as *barren* of the *Gifts themselves* as they are, only art got into a *Form*, but denyest the *True power* of God and *Demonstration* of the *Spirit* in Signs *and mighty Deeds*.

10. Pa. 33. G. W. hath this further to say, *That he doubts not but where the Spirit of* God *lives and Rules, it will manifest it self by its Fruits, for it is self-*

ſelf-evidencing, and that they have a record in Heaven, 228
and alſo in many Conſciences of the bleſſed Power of God with them and in them.]

Reply. And cannot the *Baptiſts ſay all this*, nay, and do not they many times? *They can ſay they have a Record in Heaven, and in many Conſciences alſo, who believe them*; and pray tell me G. how thou wilt get up to Heaven to ſearch the Record there and diſprove them? Did one ever hear ſuch *ſilly ſtuff* as this man writes? did he indeed think to *ſhuffle* it off with ſuch *ridiculous* words as theſe. I could tell the *Quakers* that ſome of them have a Record ſomewhere elſe, beſides the *Court of Heaven, viz.* in the *Court of* Chancery for Swearing or Oaths.

I told W. P. That if *his* Church be the *True*, and the *Baptiſts* Church falſe, (rightly to convince others thereof upon good and infallible grounds) he muſt *pretend to*, and *produce* ſome ſuch diſcriminating Evidence or Sign for Proof thereof, which the Baptiſts nor no falſe Church could in like manner produce as he doth. I pray'd W. P. to ſhew wherein the POWER of GOD or the SPIRIT DEMONSTRATED it ſelf MORE in the *Quakers* than the *Baptiſts*, or a *falſe Church?* And that he muſt do, & ſay ſomething for his Church (if he would ſay any thing to purpoſe) *which they could not do and* ſay for theirs as an *Evidence* or *Demonſtration* thereof; and that this was NO MORE *than what the true Primitive Church had, and could, and did on all neceſſary occaſions viſibly produce and Demonſtrate.* Now what does the *Quibbler* Anſwer to all this, *he ſays nothing but what the Baptiſts can or do* ſay, that they have a Record in Heaven, and in many *Conſciences* alſo, and that they doubt not but where the *Spirit* of God Lives and Rules it will *ma-*

niſeſt

nifest it self, for it is *self-Evidencing*: Then by that Rule the *Quakers* should not have the *Spirit* of God, at best, no more than others have; because it does not *manifest it self* in them *more* than in others.

11. P. 33. says G. W. *This seems to be a hard task*,] and I believe so indeed, and too hard for all the *Quakers*, though I was so *reasonable* as to demand but *one such Testimony* or *Gift* in *all* their Churches; and they never read of *any* Christian-Church in Holy Scripture, that had not *some* and *many such Gifts*. Yet G. undertakes to say, *that it is no difficult matter for* W. P. *and many more to produce or demonstrate* some such *effects of that* living Testimony, presence and power of God among us, as no false Church CAN PRODUCE: *although herein neither* W. P. *nor any of us will* ADMIT OF PREJUDICED and ENVIOUS SPIRITS *to be our* JUDGES *or* WITNESSES *in these matters*.]

Reply. Bravely *said George*, if it were as well *done*; but for all thy *boasting*, that not only W. P. but *many more* among you could; yet the poor Man, does not dare *produce*, or so much as *name* one *of them*: is not this excellent? *What must all Men believe it, because thou saiest it? Is* IPSE DIXIT *come to Town, and the Quakers* bare word *all the* Evidence *they have or can produce?*

"Now it would have been a great piece of this "*Quakers-plainness*, if he had produced one or two "or these *effects*, only, which he boasts he can, and "no *Church* which he Condemns for *false*, can pro- "duce. I charge him to do it, if he will not prove "himself a MEER PRETENDER and VAIN- "BOASTER speaking high swelling words, like "them in *Jude*. But this Man is very *timerous* I per-

I perceive he would do it with *Caution* enough, though ſo *ſilly*, that he makes himſelf *Ridiculous* by it. 1. Where did the *Apoſtles* or the *Churches* ever make ſuch a *Proviſo* in their producing the *Teſtimony* and *Power of God*? *Did they not do it before all, and in the preſence of Envious and malicious Spirits as well as others*, and left them to *judg* as it had *operation* upon them? And 2. *May not the Baptiſts ſay ſo, and make this Proviſo as well as you*, that they will not admit of prejudiced and envious Spirits to be their Judges or Witneſſes in theſe matters? and *then no doubt, they will be able to produce as many ſuch effects* as the *Quakers*: Oh ſilly and abſurd! But 3. well *G.* produce thoſe *effects*, and that *Power* thou talkeſt of in *W. P.* however, and I am contented with thee for this time, that you ſhall not admit of *Envious*, or *Prejudiced Spirits* to *Judg* of it; but produce it, that others may *behold* it, though not *Judg* of it: or wilt thou ſay, that there's not *one perſon* in all *England* (except *Quakers*) but what are *Envious* and *Prejudiced* Spirits? Poor Evaſion!

12. As for them which thou ſayſt in whoſe *Conſciences* there is a *Record*, many of which were gathered out from *Baptiſts and other Churches*. They ſay ſuch are but *Apoſtates* from their Church, and ſome ſuch you have had in your Church (which you call *Apoſtates*) when they leave you, and go to other Churches, *ſo that all this is nothing for proof of the thing*; nay ſeveral of your grand Prophets (ſo once eſteemed among ſome of you for true Prophets of the Lord) did and have left you, Witneſs CHARLES BAYLY, JOHN PARROT, *&c.* and the *Baptiſts* have gathered amongſt them ſeveral out of other Churches as well as you: and what then? The

Baptists may tell you, that if the Quakers see no such thing amongst them, as the Blessed Operation and effect of the Power and Ministry of Christ Jesus, That is because the Quakers have not honestly made Tryal, but stood in Prejudice and gainsaying, as many did against Christ, the Apostles and Primitive Church of old, and what can the Quakers say to it, ONLY DENY IT and so may the Baptists. Besides, the *Baptist*-Churches have this to say for themselves, which you have not, being you have *denied* and *disowned* it, *viz. They own the Holy* Scriptures for the Rule *of their Faith and Practice; and pretend to no such extraordinary immediate Inspirations and Revelations as you do.*

13. But above all, you ought not, you cannot, in good Conscience, complain against others for Questioning whether you are Christians, *you having first not only* Questioned *others, but* pronounced *them all, both Ministers and People, and Professors also,* unchristian. See *G. F.* Professors *Catechism*, his very first words, are, *come you* UNCHRISTIANS, *let us talk with you, &c.* Therefore look at home and rebuke your selves first for this.

14. And whereas *G. W. p.* 34. says, *That a foolish and Adulterous Generation seek a Sign*: 'Tis true, our Saviour did so upbraid *the Jews* and might very well, they having had *Sign* upon *Sign*, & *Miracle* upon *Miracle*, wrought by our SAVIOUR amongst them, and such *mighty Deeds* almost *innumerable*, wrought before them; and yet to cry out for *more*, when they saw so *many* from him, was foolish: but what is this to the *Quakers*, who have not wrought *one true Miracle*, nor produced so much as ONE *such Sign* (notwithstanding all their *Pretences*) among us, that ever

I heard of? must we therefore be a foolish Generation *that ask a* **Sign** *of them to prove such their* pretences? No surely, it follows not, I am certain, from that Text: and yet notwithstanding that the *Jews* were such an *Adulterous Generation*, and had had so *many* **Miracles** wrought among them: yet *Jesus Christ* said, they should have **one** *Sign more*, and that was doubtless the *greatest Miracle and Sign of all*: By this Text then, if the *Quakers* will stick close to it, they may *lawfully* give this Adulterous Generation **one** Sign, and that's all I ask of them.

15. And thus *G. W.* says amiss, when he talks as if *I did not acknowledg the* **sufficiency** *of the Spirits* **Evidence** and *Teaching*: for I do fully acknowledg it, where **it** APPEARS **indeed** to be (and do more fully own it than yet the *Quakers* seem to do (who are loath to own Real *Miracles* and the Gift of Tongues to be a certain EVIDENCE of the SPIRIT) 'But must I therefore own **that to be the Spirits** 'Evidence **which** every **one calls so**? or will G. W. 'himself *acknowledg it so? I dare say* not, why; then it re- 'mains that G. W. & others must *Evidence to us*, **That** 'that is **indeed the Spirits Evidence, which they** 'call so, **Before** *that either he or they can justly call* 'us UNBELIEVERS, *or* **accuse** *us for not owning the* **sufficiency** *of the Spirits-Evidence*; and this G. W. 'and all the *Quakers* in *England* must confess, or else 'I may as *justly* accuse them, for not acknowledging 'the **sufficiency** of the *Spirits Evidence* and Teach- 'ing in the Church of **Rome**, or in **Muggleton**, and 'let them clear themselves of it if they can.

16. Now since the *Quakers* will not produce any of their **Miracles**, I would not have them angry with me, if I should produce one or two; that are

the likelieſt that I know of, *if that which they ſay be* true. I never found any upon Record in their own Writings, except this may be Recorded for one: *viz.* in *G. F's Profeſſors Catechiſm, p.* 13.

And is not the POPE the MOTHER *of all your obſerving of Days, Saints days as you call them?*

According to this it ſeems *G. F.* their Grand Prophet, Converted a MAN into a WOMAN, and that a POPE too! which if true, muſt needs be a Miracle; and that it was not the Printers fault, his next words aſſured me, [And is not SHE *your Example, and not the Scripture?*] And again in another place in the ſame Page [*is not the POPE the MOTHER?*]. Then I conſidered what Pope this was, whether it might not be Pope-JOAN, that did firſt Inſtitute *Saints* Days, and ſo G. F. the Prophet by a ſtrange *impulſe* ſpeak more *Truth* than he thought of: But my Authors aſſure me, 'twas not Pope-*JOAN*; but that it was a MAN-Pope, and the name Pope ſignifieth as much as FATHER; and yet for all this, G. F. hath turned the HE, into a SHE, and Converted the MAN into a WOMAN; & yet this is the *Man* that hath helpt to ſet out a whole Book in Folio, ſhewing the ſinfulneſs and impurity of ſaying you and not thou, *to one in the ſingular.* What a Prophet? What a Scholar is this? that cannot tell the *MASCULINE Gender* from the *FEMININE?* was he (can any one think) skill'd in ſo many *Languages* as he hath ſet his Name to, that does not write true Engliſh?

17. The other thing which I ſhall leave to your own Judgments, whether it be a Miracle or not, is what is Recorded of them in the Court of Chancery, *THAT THE QUAKERS CAN TAKE AN OATH*

OATH, AND YET NOT SWEAR AT ALL; If this be ſo, ſome think it muſt be *miraculous*: *That they cannot ſwear, that they ſwear not at all, is their Principle*; *That ſeveral of them have taken Oaths and have been ſworn in* Chancery, *is upon* Record *in that Court*, as *Jer. Ives* hath ſatisfied the World by *Certificates*, in his *Queſtions for the Quakers*; and yet the *Quakers* ſtill ſay, they did not Swear nor take an Oath, which if true, muſt be wonderful at leaſt. But theſe are not ſuch Miracles and Evidence as lie neceſſarily incumbent on the *Quakers*, to produce for the better *Evidence* and *Proof* of what they ſay and *pretend to*, and therefore I ſhall ſay no more of it here, but refer them to produce *ſuch Evidence* as will indeed prove them to be *ſent of God to go forth as Apoſtles, Prophets, &c. more* than all others, and be *ſatisfactory* in Anſwer to the foregoing *Particulars*.

SECT. IV.

In Reply to his fourth Section, ſhewing the Comparison *betwixt the* QUAKERS *and* MUGGLETON *to be both* Juſt, Rational, Honeſt and Neceſſary.

G. W. P. 35. TO *compare Muggleton and them* (he ſays) *is both Idle, Quibbling and Envious Canting: What if W. P. does not pretend to more than*

Muggleton does, will it therefore follow, the Quakers are Impostors, or like him, who holds many Blasphemies? The Baptists may be ashamed of such grosse and abusive Insinuations as these.]

Reply. Stay *George*, be not so *hot*, run not so *fast*, give me leave to call thee back again, and tell thee, that if the *Comparison* in my *Epistle* was any *abuse*, that it was not the *Baptists* that did it, but I; and therefore if so, I am to bear the blame of it: But neither they nor I need to be ashamed of doing it, that I see as I shall now shew you; and if you had exercised a *good Conscience* you might have seen it your self and spared me the Labour.

1. Then I say, That if *W. P.* does not pretend to more than **Muggleton**, yet if he or the *Quakers* pretend to have received immediately *a Commission from Heaven*, and *Divine Revelations*, *and inspired by the Spirit of God to go forth as Apostles, Prophets, &c. as Muggleton* does, and yet he be an **Impostor** as he is, *then if the Quakers can produce* **no more** *for theirs than Muggleton does for his*, it will follow, that *the Quakers are also* **Impostors**: And do thou Answer it if thou canst, and so thou hast thy idle *Quibbling* and envious *Canting* return'd on thy self.

2. And for thy accusing *Muggleton* with **Blasphemies**, it is as certain that he accuses you with **Blasphemies**, and many others have condemned you also as holding *apparent Blasphemies*: then by this *thou* art as well condemned as *Muggleton* is condemned by thee, so that this will be no Proof; and besides, *How wilt thou evidence to others, That all what thou sayest and callest* **Blasphemy**, *is such indeed? or doest thou think thy bare word is sufficient for all others*

to

to give Credence to and build their Faith on? ſo that here the *doubt* and *Queſtion* will *remain ſtill.* 232

3. I am verily perſwaded in my heart, that many *Quakers* have cenſured ſeveral Doctrines for Blaſphemy, (which yet are not truly ſo) as if they had the *Romiſh* Authority, and every one of them a Pope within him.

Take an Inſtance out of *G. W.* himſelf, *Iſhmael*, p. 9. *For a Man's ſaying, That it is all one to ſay the Scripture ſaith, and God ſaith:*] G. calls him, *thou Blaſphemous Beaſt, doſt thou make no difference between the Scripture and God?* ——— *here let all that reads this, ſee thy Blaſphemy*: Now *George*, let me ask thee, if a Man ſhould affirm, it is all one to ſay thy Book *Iſhmael* ſaith, and the *Spirit* of God ſaith, whether this would be Blaſphemy? (ſince in thy *Title-Page* thou aſſerts, *it was given forth from the Spirit of the Lord in us*,) and was not that given forth by *Scripture*, *Writing*, or *Speech?* If thou ſayeſt *no*, then thou haſt condemned the Man wrongfully, unleſs thou wilt ſay that *that Book of yours was given forth* more, by the *Spirit of the Lord, than the Holy Scriptures are*: If thou ſayeſt *yes*, it is Blaſphemy, *then thou proveſt thy ſelf a* Blaſphemer *by Intitling that, as given forth by the Spirit of the Lord in you, which he did not ſay, and give forth.*

4. Wouldſt thou not think it very hard and unjuſt, if one ſhould accuſe the *Quakers* of Blaſphemy, for ſaying, That *the Church of Chriſt is his Body, and that there is but one Spirit and one Body, which is the Church, and ſo deny that Chriſt hath any other Body, than that whereof the Saints are Members and united to him*, as thou talkeſt to this purpoſe? p. 29. Now ſome look upon this as *Blaſphemous*, wouldſt thou not ſay

it is very *hard* and *uncharitable*? and why, because this is *according to Scripture-Language sayest thou*: And yet thou hast accused *Muggleton*, *p.* 37. as a Blasphemer and Impostor for holding this *Blasphemous* Doctrine; *That the Soul of Man dies or is Mortal.* Now may not *Muggleton* tell thee, that the Scripture saith in express words, *The* Soul *that sinneth* it *shall* die, Ezek. 18. 20. *God shall deliver my* Soul *from the Power of the* Grave, Psal. 49. 15. *Thou hast delivered my* Soul *from* Death, Psal. 56. 13. *Thou hast delivered my* Soul *from the lowest* Grave, Psal. 86. 13. *Keep back his* Soul *from the* Pit: *his* Soul *draweth nigh to the* Grave, Job. 33. 18, 22, 28; 30. *Then saith he unto them,* My Soul *is exceeding sorrowful even unto* Death, Matth. 26. 38. spake of the Resurrection of CHRIST, *that his* Soul *was not left in Hell* [*or the* Grave,] *Acts* 2. 31. Is not this *Scripture?* Is not this according to Scripture-Language? *Thus then thou condemnest something as* Blasphemy, *which is according to* Scripture-Language, and so it seems it is all one to thee, be it according to Scripture-Language or not; thou joynest them all together as alike *false* and *Blasphemous*. Besides there is no Protestant Church in *Europe* that I know of, but what can approve the third Doctrine in thy 37. *pag.* (which thou callest Blasphemous) for True, in the indefinite Terms thou hast expressed it, *viz. That the Soul of Man is Mortal, i. e.* Subject to the second Death, if not Redeemed.

And because *G. W.* hath a *Multiplying*-Glass when he writes against his *opposers*, he hath made here (to lengthen them out) eight several *Doctrines*, which *indeed* can be reckoned but one or two in *effect* or much the same: and as for those other *Blasphe-*

mous

mous Doctrines of *Muggleton* reſpecting the *God-*
head Life, and that the Godhead died; thou G. ac- 233
cording to thy Principles muſt hold ſo too, or elſe thou *muſt* run into another Blaſphemy; by hold-ing that THE CHRIST INDEED did NOT DIE, only put off HIS GARMENT with which thou ſayeſt he was Cloathed, but was not THE CHRIST nor no Real part of HIM. And therefore upon this account your *Predeceſſors*, (who held much the ſame Doctrine with you concerning the TRINITY of PERSONS,) found a neceſſity on them to hold that the FATHER Died, as *Muggleton* does, and there-fore were called PATROPASSIANS; for without that they found they could not Really believe, that THE CHRIST HIMSELF DIED, and this Di-lemma (if not Blaſphemy) the *Quakers* are got in-to; and if the *Quakers* did not come *very near* this *Blaſphemous* Doctrine of *Muggleton*, What is the meaning of *Iſaac Pennington's* words, *Queſt. p.* 20. *But he* [CHRIST] *is of an* Eternal Nature, *and his Fleſh and Blood and Bones are of his Nature*, [that is, then, his Fleſh, Blood and Bones are Eternal; and ſo muſt be GOD, for nothing is of an Eternal Nature, but GOD] and now let the Reader Judg how far this falls ſhort of *Muggleton's* Blaſphemy; and let them clear themſelves of it if they can, ſo that it appears, this is only a *Pitiful* begging the Queſti-on *ſtill, betwixt the* Impoſtor *Muggleton* and *you*, which cannot be granted you by *Muggleton*, nor yet by *others*, without your producing better evi-dence: for you ſee he can ſpeak according to *Scrip-ture-Language* as well as you, when he hath a mind to it.

5. Whereas

5. Whereas thou sayest the comparison is *unjust* and *wicked*, Thou dost not so much as Instance any *one* particular of the ten, that is *unjust* or *false*: But thou wilfully mistakes me, when thou insinuates, as if I did basely design by the *Comparison* to make others believe, that the *Quakers* were *Muggletonians* or the *Muggletonians Quakers*: No, that was never my *intent*, but thy own *perversion*, on purpose to *Evade* and *shuffle* it off where thou foundst it lay *too heavie* upon thy *Shoulders*; neither canst thou find any such word in all my Epistle, but well to the contrary, as the tenth particular witnesseth, *That the Quakers Condemn Muggleton, and Muggleton damn's the Quakers*; therefore any Man might see (except *G.* who is wilfully blind) that I never thought them all one or alike in all things, and *G.* might have spared all his needless labour to set down wherein the *Quakers* differ from *Muggleton* in other Doctrines, but that the poor Man could *easier* do that, than Answer what I demanded of *W. P.* But this is the *old* Shift that I have formerly told them of, they used in the Dispute, *Answer that which was never askt them, to give the* go-by *and evade Answering what is askt*, and thus he serves me here.

'The thing that I demanded of *W. P.* was this; 'in my *Epist. p.* 32, 33. *Why shouldst thou or thy* 'Friends be believed MORE *than Muggleton or an Im-* 'postor? Since *Muggleton* says he hath received a 'Commission from Heaven, that he had it by Divine 'Revelation to go forth as a Prophet, *&c.* That he is 'inspired by the Spirit of God, and is infallible, *&c.* 'and so say the *Quakers* that they have. And again, 'in my *p.* 35. Is it not highly necessary one should 'know which of these are the Impostors? Or whether

ther (since they both are such confident Pretenders) 234
'they may not *both* be Impostors? What canst or dost
'thou produce or pretend to more than *Muggleton*
'does? Surely it will be a strange piece of Confidence
'for you to claim Credence from People, if you
'cannot produce something considerable beyond such
'(as your selves own to be) a GRAND IMPOSTOR
'and a DECEIVER. But very deceitfully *G.* gives the go-by to all this, which was the only thing in *Question*, and yet calls his Treatise an *Answer* to my Epistle: Is it possible, that the *Quakers* that *pretend* so much, should be Men of no better *Conscience*? How can any look upon such to be *tender, and Men fearing God*, and *hating deceit and falshood*? Is this think you for the *Credit* or *Commendation* of your way? will such *unfair* dealing, shifting and shuffling *of Answers, convince the Baptists or me, or any other sober and discreet Men that you are* immediately *sent and Commissioned for to go forth as* Apostles *and* Prophets *from the most Holy God? No surely.* Dost thou call this the Quakers-plainness, detecting Fallacy? It is the *Quakers* own *Fallacy* it then detects. Let thy own Conscience (if thou hast any that is not *hardned*) Judg, and let all *intelligent* Readers Judg.
'*This is then the thing that I did, and do still demand*
'*of thee, Why shouldst thou or thy Friends be believed*
'more *than Muggleton or an* Impostor, *that thou*
'*speakest immediately from the spirit of God, and that*
'*thou hast a* Commission *from Heaven, and he not?*
'*What canst or dost thou produce, say or pretend to*
'more *than Muggleton does, whom yet your selves say*
'*is* AN Impostor *and a* Deceiver.

6. Instead of that *G. W. p.* 36. *weakly* tells me, that some of the *Baptists* have *denied the Father and*

Son

Son to be two distinct Persons, and then cites *Hicks* Dialogue, *p.* 9. What's this in Answer to my Epistle? And yet for ought I understand, he hath *falsly* accused Mr. *Hicks* therein; for on the Contrary, he doth expresly own the *Father* and *Son* to be two *distinct* Persons; and then *G.* would basely come off, by saying, *wherein they* Imply *the Father and Son to be one Person without us*; whereas I do not find one such word in all *T. H.*'s Dialogues, and I dare say the thought never entred into his heart: but what falshood will not this Man use? Not regarding either his own *Honour* or *Reputation*, nor that of his *Religion* (which yet he pretends to) whilst he defends it by such *base means*: To accuse a Man *positively*, and then when he comes to prove it, he doth but barely say it is *implied*, when indeed it is not *implied*; and I know not why my *Testimony* should not be as good as *G. W's.*

7. *G. W. p.* 36. *What if Quakers pretend to these* viz. *that they have received a Commission from Heaven, that they had it by Divine Revelation, that they are inspired by the Spirit of God, that they are infallible? Says he, the Apostles and true Church did not only pretend to,* but experience the same, *does it therefore follow that they must be compared with the Muggletonians and be deemed* Impostors?

Reply. That ever any Man in his wits should make himself so *Ridiculous* in Print, as *G. W.* here does! For, 1. Because the Apostles and true Church did pretend to these things, and *did EXPERIENCE* the SAME, and could visibly demonstrate them, and so were no Impostors nor like *Muggleton*: Must therefore the *Quakers* and *Muggleton* who pretend to these things, but do not experience *the same, nor can* visibly demonstrate *them* as the *true* Apostles did,

did, be no Impostors? on the contrary it directly follows, *that the Quakers* and *Muggleton* pretending *to these things*, and *not* experiencing *the same*, *nor visibly* Demonstrating *them as the true* Apostles did, are Impostors; and get off of it, if you can.

2. Cannot *Muggleton* also say, *what if he as led by the Spirit* of *Truth pretend to these things, the Apostles and true Church did not only pretend to*, but *experienced the same, does it therefore follow that he must be compared with, and deemed an* Impostor? What Answer wouldst thou make to *Muggleton*? Take the *same* to thy self and thou wilt be *Answered*.

8. And thus hast thou made thy self *Ridiculous*, and thy *deceit* and *Hypocrisie* apparent to others; and therefore *George* since thou hast undertaken for thy Brother *Penn* to Answer my *Epistle*, I will not let thee go free so, no no, I cannot be satisfied with thy shuffles and such poor Shifts. I intend now not to leave thee, till thou hast indeed *Answered* to the MATTER in Dispute, or made thy *own* Folly and vain-boasting, manifest to all Men of sound understanding; still asserting, *That it is a strange piece of Confidence for you to censure* and *condemn others, or to claim Credence from People, if you cannot produce something considerable BEYOND such* (*as your selves own to be*) *a GRAND IMPOSTOR* and a *DECEIVER*.

And I do still demand of you, *What can or do you produce, say and pretend to*, more *than Muggleton does*? ‘*Or why shouldst* thou *in particular, G. W. be believed* MORE than Muggleton or an Impostor, ‘*in thy Pretences of having Received* an Immediate ‘*Commission and Ministry from Heaven*, Infallibility ‘*and immediate Inspirations from the Spirit of God, to go forth as an* Apostle, *or a* Prophet? And this

lies

lies at thy door ſtill, notwithſtanding all thy pitiful *Evaſions* and deceitful *equivocations* And this is ſufficient for thy fourth Section.

SECT. V.

In Reply to his fifth Section, about SABELLIUS *and the Agreement of the Quakers Doctrine with his touching* the three Perſons.

G. W. P. 41. Tells me, that *becauſe I did not lay down particularly what thoſe old exploded Fancies of* Sabellius *were, I am ſmiting at them in the dark.*

Reply. Is not this indeed Ingenious? I writ my Epiſtle to *W. P.* who is generally known to be a Scholar, and a Man of Learning, and could not well be thought ſo Ignorant, or of ſo little Reading, as not to know who *Sabellius* was, and what his Opinions which were exploded; therefore it was altogether needleſs for me to lay down what I concluded he knew as well as my ſelf. But now a Man who is unlearned, or no good Scholar, comes in his Ignorance, and undertakes to Scribble me an Anſwer, and for want of ſo much Light and Learning in himſelf accuſes me of ſmiting at them in the Dark.

2. To Inform this Man and enlighten his dark mind in this particular: I underſtand that *Sabellius* was one who denied **there was a Trinity of Perſons** *he denied there were three perſons, ſaying all three were one.*

one, Epip. hæreſ. 62. Aug. lib. hær. [as the Quakers now do] *And ſo confound the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and impiouſly imagined three Names in one thing and in one Perſon, therefore not without cauſe we forbid them the Church, &c. Soc. Schol. lib. 2.*

Theſe and the like were the *Exploded Fancies* that were long ſince revealed by *SABELLIUS* without, rather than by the Light within; and ſuch-like are now the Quakers Fancies which they pretend are revealed to them by the *Light within*, notwithſtanding all their plauſible Quibbles and equivocating *pretences* ſometimes to the contrary, as is manifeſted in this foregoing Diſcourſe.

3. *G. W. p.* 42, 43. inſtead of anſwering my Epiſtle tells me, *that ſome of the Baptiſts have denied the Divinity of Chriſt.*

Reply. Quid hoc ad rem? I never requeſted that of him or *W. P.* I matter no more what ſome of the Baptiſts hold, than what ſome of the Quakers do hold: But it ſeems *G.* found it much eaſier for him to ſet down what Doctrines ſome of the Baptiſts have held, *than to prove and make good ſuch Doctrines as himſelf holds.* If he hath any thing to ſay to the Baptiſts, it is likely enough they may be able to Anſwer for themſelves, as well as he can for himſelf if not better, becauſe *they own the Holy Scriptures to be their Rule, and not their own Spirit or Fancy within.* But if not, what's all this to me? I am no Baptiſt, and ſo I told *W. P.* before; Therefore this is no better than a Quibbling Evaſion in lieu of an Anſwer.

4. *G. W,* p. 44. ſeemeth to like the Cloſe of my Epiſtle better than the reſt. It's well if any thing (that's not a Quakers) can pleaſe him. I aſſure him

I thought on it at the beginning of that and this also & do wish that he had been so ingenious as to have considered of it in his Answer, and that he would honestly confess with me *humanum est Errare* rather than only to commend it as some kind of Ingenuity in another; and I believe the same *humility and submissiveness* may become him and all the Quakers as well, and better than *high and empty pretences without greater proof.*

I have all along purposely avoided forming the Arguments into Syllogisms, and used this plain way of discourse, that so it might the better suit with the Capacities of the Vulgar and be the more beneficial to the understandings of such well-meaning persons, who yet notwithstanding, may not be well acquainted with a Syllogistical method, neither understand rightly what Mood and figure are no more than *Hebrew* or *Arabick*, and therefore can be no competent Judges thereof, when they read it in that Form.

Now no Quaker ought to (or can honestly upon his own Principles) blame me for what I have Writ, because they say, every *man hath the Light within him, and ought to Act according to that light within himself*, which I have here done; and I can *seriously* tell them, that the Light and Spirit *within me* beareth Witness *to it*: and then although the *Quakers* should think amiss of it, or say it is *bad*, yet how could I help it, according to their principle, teaching me, *That that ought to be my* grand Rule *to square all my Actions by?* And would they have me *disobey* that? Or have a *better* Light than I can have? or would they have me attempt to *Invalidate the Light within me, or Gods Immutable and absolute Decree*, within? which would be a *great Impiety* but to think of, they

should

they ſhould either *Change* their *Creed*, in this parti- 237.
cular, or ſeem leſs *concerned* at what I have before and now thus writ, it being *confeſſedly* a *Duty*: neither I hope will the *Quakers* blame me for arguing thus, it being no *worſe* way of arguing than what Mr. *Penn* hath thought good to uſe againſt twenty one Learned Divines, p. 22. nor can the *Quakers* tell me upon their own *Principles* without Blaſphemy (which yet ſome of them have been ſo weak as to do) *that the Light within me is* Darkneſs; for they ſay *that the Light within every Man is Chriſt, and Chriſt is God, and* GOD *and* CHRIST, *I am ſure are not, nor can be* Darkneſs.

In ſhort, I do truly profeſs that I have done nothing herein, but with *a good* Conſcience, *and an honeſt* Deſign. 1. With *a good* Conſcience, I not having either *wilfully* or *knowingly* wronged the *Quakers* in any one particular, and if *unwillingly* there ſhould happen any *miſtake* to be committed by me (as poſſibly there may be, conſidering the weakneſs that all *men* are ſubject unto (unleſs Quakers) *& Berverdus non videt omnia*) which yet I think there will none appear, I having uſed the greateſt *Care and Circumſpection* that my occaſions and time would give me leave, to prevent all: however I have that freedom of mind, that I ſhould not be aſhamed *honeſtly* to acknowledg it in Print and beg their *excuſe* for it. If they would be ſo *Ingenious* with me, and *acknowledg* the *wrong* that *G. W.* hath done me (as well as himſelf) in his pretended *Anſwer*. 2. With *an honeſt* Deſign, it being *plainly to inform* and *Caution* others to prevent their being deluded with ſuch vain *pretences*, and high ſwelling words amongſt the *Quakers*, when it doth not appear they have any thing in *rea-*

lity among them, MORE than many other Churches have, but a great deal less in many things, and to put the Quakers (if it may be) into a better *sense* and *sight* of themselves: that they may consider their own poverty, nakedness, weakness and formality, notwithstanding all their *vain* boasting, and *high* pretences of *Revelations* more than *others*; and might be *shamed* out of their *unmeasurable* Confidence and *quibbling* equivocations. The Quakers say they have the Spirit with measure; but it is certain many of their leaders have Confidence without measure. I shall conclude with this serious Expostulation (of the *Psalmist*) to them, *Psal.* 4. 2. *Oh ye Sons of Men, how long will ye turn my Glory into shame! how long will ye love vanity, and seek after Leasing?* Selah! And my Prayer shall be that of the Apostles, 2 *Thes.* 3. 2. *That we may be delivered from* [absurd] UNREASONABLE and WICKED Men.

Many more of their QUIBBLES I could (and may if I think there is necessary occasion) *intimate* to you and them; but having herein exceeded the brevity I first intended I will now forbear, and if they please to return an Answer to this, in plainness INDEED, singleness of heart and honesty, without RAILING EQUIVOCATIONS, or MENTAL RESERVATIONS, to the particular and very MATTERS in question, (without BEGGING the question) I shall take it *candidly* and receive it kindly; but if instead thereof, they shall *revile*, *huff*, or *Hector*, I shall the less value and regard it.

AN

AN ADVERTISEMENT TO *G. Whitehead, W. Penn,* and the QUAKERS.

1. TO prevent any more of your *needless* Scribbling and that neither the *World* nor *my ſelf* be peſtered and troubled with ſuch ſtuff ſo little to the purpoſe for the *future*, but that if we have any Anſwer, it may be AD REM, plain indeed and more *ſatisfactory*, I do here before hand give you, or any other that may undertake for you, NOTICE, That if any of you do, (or pretend to) make a *Return* to this my *Reply*, and inſtead of *ſpeaking directly* to THE THING that I have *objected* againſt you (and which G. *W.* hath undertaken to *Anſwer*, and ſo is *ingaged* thereby to do it, ſince it yet remains *undone*) you make Anſwer to SOMEWHAT ELSE, that I never *mentioned* nor *deſired* of you: Or if in lieu of Anſwering to THE MATTER *in direct and plain* Terms, either by affirmative or negative Propoſitions, you ſhall propoſe NEW QUESTIONS *before the former are decided already by you undertaken*, which can be only *deſignedly* and *deceitfully* to draw us away from

the MATTER in hand, (Both which shifting evasions, G. *W.* hath all along *used*, as I have already often *hinted* to him, and acquainted the *World*,) that then I shall look upon all SUCH WORK to be no SATISFACTORY or PLAIN ANSWER, but a MEER EVASION and SENSELESS SCRIBBLING; yea, and I shall take it to be a manifest Sign of the DESPERATE weakness and baffling of your CAUSE, if you are still constrained to use such mean and base Artifices and *pittiful* Shifts to EVADE an Answer notwithstanding you are NOW forewarned to AVOID them. And so shall look upon my self not much (if at all) *concerned* in any such like pretended and Elusive Answer, as I have (I hope) sufficiently demonstrated this of G. *W*'s to be hardly worth a Man's time to take notice of, (it being in the Judgment of many understanding and Judicious Persons, no more a *real* Answer to me and the main *intent* of my Epistle, than if he had in effect said just nothing) except to shew the VANITY and FOLLY of it to prevent (if any thing will do it) their TRIFLING so for the future.

2. As once again to instance (because I would beat it into their *heads*, though not so, as they beat (or pinch) persons out of their *meetings*) I told Mr. *Penn*, that *he had the words of man's wisdom indeed, but did ask him where the Demonstration of the Spirit was with him in* POWER *and mighty* Signs; *and told him that if he could shew but* ONE *in his Church that had such Spiritual Gifts upon his turning Quaker, as was immediately inspired into those Members of the true Church in the Apostles times, upon their becoming Christians, it would put a clear* difference *betwixt them and the Baptists, and herein then they would* EXCEED

CEED *the Baptists, but now they did not.*

Now what is *G. W's.* Answer to me in this, he does not say, It is true, nor dares affirm it is false; nor does he produce *ONE* such in his Church, nor yet *plainly* and *honestly* say, he cannot: now any one of these had been a plain Answer, For that was it he pretended in his Title, *viz.* the *Quakers plainness, &c.* But instead thereof, (alas nothing, but asks *NEW QUESTIONS, viz. What if God will not bestow such Gifts and Signs now?* And who is it can tell *G's meaning* or *Answer* in these words? does he mean *God will*, or *God will not?* I challenge him to say if he dares, negatively, *That God will not now bestow such gifts on his Church*, or if he had rather, Positively, *That God will now*, and yet surely *one* of them he must mean; but how shall another Man know which, for if I should say he means *affirmatively*, he may say *nay*, I do not say, *God will* now; and if I say *negatively*, he may say *nay*, I only *queried* it, but did not say, *God will not* now.

Now then let all unbyassed *Readers* Judg, how this then can be either a *Certain* or *Plain* Answer: this is like indeed the *Quakers Plainness*; for here's Equivocation and the *Quakers* Quibble still, yea and another Question, *What say you Baptists to this Proposal?* And yet another, *must this conclude the Controversy?* nay, and one more, *Who then shall escape your Censure?* nay and another upon that, *Have not the Jesuites in this wise Argued?* And two or three more such *Questions*, p. 13, 14. I would fain know of any sober Man in his right Wits, whether this be a *plain* Answer, *or any Answer* at all to me? he speaking to the Baptists and asking Questions of them, that's nothing to me.

3. And so about Muggleton, when the thing I requested of Mr. *Penn*, was, *Why he or his friends should be believed* MORE *than* Muggleton *or an* Impostor? *and what he could say, pretend to, and produce more than* Muggleton *or an* Impostor *could say, pretend to, and produce as he did? They both* pretending an immediate *Commission from Heaven and to be* true Prophets, *&c.* G. W. does not once go about to shew me *why, nor wherefore*, nor does so much as SAY or *produce ONE* thing which Muggleton or an Impostor cannot: no, not a word, but *instead* of that tells me, *Muggleton and the Quakers are not one, and that he holds many Blasphemous Doctrines which they do not, and that they had writ against him.*

Who ever doubted of this? I did not, I knew it all very well before, and therefore did not ask Mr. *Penn* any such thing; and I can as well tell G. W. that *Muggleton* hath *writ* against the *Quakers*, will that prove him to be no Impostor? If not, why should their *writing* against him prove them no Impostors? And if *Muggleton* holds Blasphemous Doctrines, will it therefore follow, that the *Quakers* may not hold Blasphemous Doctrines, and so may be Impostors also? no surely: *the Quakers may be* Impostors, *notwithstanding Muggleton's holding* Blasphemous *Doctrines.* One would think the *Quakers* should be ashamed of their so *silly Arguing*, 'tis a sign they stand but upon a *Sandy Foundation* when they have *no other* and *better* Arguments to produce for *themselves*. But I did not, nor do yet know what Demonstrative Evidence and Reason you can give, why *you* should be Believed MORE than the Baptists, or lookt upon by any, to be a truer Church than they, nay nor yet, why

your

your pretended Commission from Heaven should be *Credited* MORE than Muggletons: and therefore I prayed *W. P.* to tell me that. Now can any man think this of *G.W.* to be a *plain* and *satisfactory* Answer to that: As if when I talk of REASONS, G. W. he presently thinks of PLUMBS, and much at that rate he Answers me: *Oh strange Quakerism! That it should sometimes bereave men both of their* Consciences *and* Wits *at once! And yet make them so strangely confident as to appear wilfully blind (if not impudent) in such their palpable Evasions, and notorious Equivocations, in the face of the World.*

4. My *Epistle* was but very short, and let it be remembred it was *Expostulatory*, and yet *G. W.* in his *Plainness*, gives the *Plain* go-by, to one whole *Paragraph* in it, *viz.* the third in *p.* 14, and 15. where I expostulated and demanded of *W. P. if he was faithful*, and *just to his Agreement, or if he was Reasonable in himself, to oppose with three men besides against one, &c.* He takes not the least notice of it, and *p.* 16. I inquired of W. P. whether *T. Hicks* might not then say *in W. P's own Language, Thou art a Forger, and hast forged this Distinction for thy Friend, it not being set down in thy own Friends Book: and that it was such a silly Distinction as was impossible to hold* good, *if the* Quakers *Principle touching the Christ hold* true: and many more such *Expostulations* that G.W. says not *one word* to, and yet this it seems I must take for an *Answer* and the *Quakers-Plainness*, (& it is very likely most of their poor Disciples take it as SUCH, and willingly believe it upon the *Credit of* their *Leaders*, or the bare Report of some of their *Friends* as if it was so indeed, without ever reading it *judiciously* and *examining* it throughly: Ah poor

deceived and deluded Souls!) THEREFORE that you may not pretend *Ignorance*, nor *unneceſſarily* imploy your ſelves to no *purpoſe*, except it be to EVADE AN ANSWER, whilſt you *hypocritically* pretend to GIVE ONE: which will but *Evince* your Cauſe to *be foul* and *deſperate* that needs ſuch a *Cloak* to hide it, (which yet you have worn now *Thredbare* by your ſo often *uſing* it in your Anſwers to other men's *Books*) I have thought good *here to* give you NOTICE of it, and *acquaint* you what will be *honeſt*, *plain*, *and ſatisfactory*, but that ſuch *Shifts* and *Quibbles* as you have already uſed, *are not*, *will not*, *nor can be ſo*.

5. After all I have already ſaid, I freely declare, I ſtand almoſt aſtonied at the *Prodigious* CONFIDENCE of the *Leading* Quakers (or the Foxonian Tribe) audacious Attempts in ſuch *Evaſive Replies* to their *Opponents*, daubed over (to beguile the ſimple-hearted or deceived Quakers) with *ſeeming Vindications*, when their dreadful *accuſing* Conſciences (if not abſolutely *ſeared*) at the ſame time cannot but tell them how greatly the *ſincerer* ſort of *Quakers* have been *burthened*, yea grievouſly *afflicted* theſe many years, (under the ſence of Guilt that reſts on thoſe called the BODY) I may ſay even to the higheſt Degree of *Perplexity*, witneſs, *J. P. W. M. J. O. W. G. T. M. M. S. T F. J. F. M. P. A. M.* with many more; and although ſome of them may have *truckled* under the TYRANNICAL power of this BODY (ſo called) *i. e.* their *Church* (though it be indeed *Principally*, but of *G. Foxes* Building) yet their Conſciences cannot but bear Witneſs to what I have ſaid in this Reſpect. Here's all that can be ſaid in favour of ſuch wicked Practices, that it ſeems they

muſt

must by Decree (to uphold their Cause as long as they can) set SOMETHING forth in Print as an Answer, or that bears the *Title* of an *Answer*, to all that comes out against them. 24/

6. It must be a very strong and notorious Delusion, these *Leading-Quakers* are under, if they do not see themselves manifestly Guilty of Abominable *Equivocations* and *Quibbling* in the greatest matters of *Faith* and *Religion* controverted between them and others: Insomuch, that notwithstanding their *now* loud pretences of professing *Christ*, according to the *Holy* Scriptures (so long as they do not nor will *disclaim* their Former Professions to the *Contrary*, and their former *abuses*, put upon the Scriptures) and notwithstanding their loud Clamors against the Socinians, as denying the Divinity of Christ; yet themselves must know, that they deny CHRIST to be either *God* or *Man* in the sence that Christians acknowledg him to be so, see *Contest for Christianity*, p. 115, 116, 117. and *Controv. ended*, p. 44. to 54. And consequently they Introduce into the profession of *Religion* and the *Scriptures* such Equivocations and ambiguous Quibbling, as *Renders* the most *Religious Confessions*, *Profound Deceits*, and the *Words* of *God* Recorded in Scripture, no better than a Nose of Wax, most dangerous and false.

7. There are five or six little Books that do very ingeniously and fully set forth and give an accompt of the *Deceit*, *Impostures*, intolerable *Pride*, *Hypocrisy*, and *Tyranny*, with the *Popish* Principles and *vile* Practices of some of your *Leaders* and *Ministers* of the Foxonian party, chiefly in *Matters* of Fact, which are visible to the *Eyes* and subject to the *Senses* of Men, *viz.*

The

The Spirit of the Quakers tryed,
Controversy ended,
The Spirit of the Hat,
Tyranny and Hypocrisy detected,
Questions for the Quakers,
to which may be added
The Quakers Spiritual-Court.

The which, or some of them at least, I should advise all Persons *Judiciously* to peruse, that would be *informed* concerning them: For notwithstanding that the *Quakers* have Printed *something* that bears the Name of Answers, I do seriously think and hereby advertise them, that those *Books* are IN EFFECT as much *un-answered* as if they had not writ twenty lines about it, for indeed what these *Quakers* have writ in *Reply*, is but ABOUT it, not TO it. They beat about the *Bush* and that's *all*, they make the greatest *noise* like the *Lapwing*, when indeed they are *farthest off*.

What shall I say to your poor pittiful, slight, shifting evasive and equivocating Replies to these *Books*? What shall I say to that heavy Charge of TYRANNY and HYPOCRISY exhibited against you in the Book bearing that Title?

What shall I say to that equal, just, and fair *Proffer* made to you therein? and your not accepting of it? p. 49. and Title-Page. 'Tis offered over and over again to the *Quakers*: 'To refer the Judgment of 'matters of Fact to the verdict of twelve impartial and 'honest men, EQUALLY to be chosen, and that in case 'the Quakers & the others should not agree in the choice 'of the Persons; it was proposed, that the Umpirage 'should be referred to the LORD-MAJOR of London

or

'or any Alderman on the Bench, or to any one of 242
'twenty Common-Council-men, and if the Quakers
'would put it to this just honest and fair Issue, that they
'should signifie it in writing, and leave it with Francis
'Smith Bookseller (dwelling in Cornhil) and they
'should find their Accusers ready to comply there-
'with.

Now, why dare and do you not thus adventure the *Tryal* of it? And why will W. P. notwithstanding *Cry* out for *Proof*, and *exclaim* that you are horribly belied and slandered; and that they are all **Lies, Slanders** and **Forgeries**, (and this is the *chiefest* part of your *Answers*:) If they are so *indeed*, or ye *Quakers* so *innocent* therein as you would pretend, nothing could possibly more *honour* and *advantage* the *Quakers* and their *Cause* here, as clearly to *Evince* it and have this **Judged** for them by *honest* and *impartial* Men on both sides; and it being only **matter of Fact**, such men are *capable* to judg of it: for *shame* then W. P. and ye *Quakers* do not any more cry out **Gross Lies, Slanders and Forgeries**, till you have *agreed* to this *fair propose*, and have had the *matters* indifferently **heard**, as so long *profferred* you, and it be **proved** so: what will ye thus decline the *Proof* and Tryal, and yet *exclaim* as *wronged*? oh unreasonable!

8. What shall I say? What can be said to such Men? What can be *expected* from them? Or who (that is not infatuated) can *believe* them or approve of their **Confidence**, whereby they make themselves *ridiculous*, and manifest to the world, that some of them have neither *tender Consciences* nor *shame* in them, to stand in things with such **perverseness** of Spirit (not to say **Impudence**) against not only *Common* Sence and

and REASON, But OCULAR DEMONSTRATION, saying any thing *Backwards* or *Forwards* as they please, and that without *Blushing*: I will name but three Instances now.

1. Witness those many *Texts* of *Scripture perverted, altered, changed,* and *corrupted by G. Fox,* when he charges others with falshood, corrupting and perverting the Scriptures, for doing the like or less as is set forth in several particulars in the *Spirit of the Quakers tryed,* where in some places *G. Fox* puts THEM for HIM, *Col.* 3. 10. Conscience for Thoughts, *Rom.* 2. 15. he puts Christ's Belly for the Believers Belly, *John* 7. 38. puts another person into the Text, *John* 10. 29. Leaves out the SPIRIT, in 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. puts IT for WE, in 2 *Cor.* 2. 16. IS for WAS, in 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. Leaves out the word WILFULLY, in *Heb.* 10. 26. puts *Speaking* for *Prophecying*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 31. *&c.* Now as that *Author* says well, any one that can but Read and understand *English*, and knows that A is not B, or HIM is not THEM, or that IT is not, nor can be WE, may know that *G. Fox hath committed* Falshoods, altered, changed and corrupted several Scriptures, and yet Mr. *Penn* hath undertaken to vindicate him in these matters, though *against his own & other* Mens Eyes, and yet if you will credit *W. Penn*, this is the Spirit of Truth, or the Truth that he vindicates.

2. Nay, let *G. Fox* their *grand* Prophet not only speak the greatest NONSENCE, but *Write* it and publish it also, to the World in *Print*; yet Mr. *Penn* will vindicate it and Justifie him also; *G. Foxe's* words are these, [And so to the word Christ Jesus, him by whom the World was made before it

it was made] and this G. *Fox* says SEVEN times over in his Book; and *another* time thus, [By which the World was made before it was made] Now if any Man that understands *English* and *Sense* (except a *Quaker*) will not say this is *absolute* NONSENCE that G. *F.* here ascribes to CHRIST, and not fit for any Man of *Ingenuity*, and that is a *Scholar* or regards his *Credit*, to vindicate, then I am wonderfully deceived and know not my Mother-Tongue; and yet if you will believe *W. Penn*, this is the Truth or Spirit of Truth still which he vindicates, oh horrid! 243

3. Nay more, Write and Print BLASPHEMY, and then *stand* in it and *Justifie* it when they have *done*: Witness, *Solomon Eccles* (one of these Quaking *Ministers*) in his Book, called the *Quakers Challenge*; he says of GEORGE FOX, *whose name thou art not worthy to take into thy mouth, who is a Prophet indeed, and hath been faithful in the Lords business from the beginning. It was said of* CHRIST, That he was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not; SO IT MAY BE SAID OF THIS TRUE PROPHET, whom John said, HE WAS NOT; But thou wilt feel this Prophet one day, as heavy as a Mill-stone upon thee, *&c.*

And yet *G. Whitehead* undertakes to *vindicate* this BLASPHEMOUS SPEECH, and says, *it is a* LITTLE FAILURE *in Syntax*, (for so his *Conscience* will serve him to call BLASPHEMY, when it is uttered and published by a QUAKER, though against the Lord CHRIST) ah *George!* canst thou call it but a LITTLE FAILURE, is that a *Truth?* At the best, surely it is no less than a GREAT FAILURE.

and

9. And as for *George's* DIRECTION of *Sol. Eccles* INTENTION in *G. W's* serious search *p.* 58. I pray my *Reader* and you *Quakers*, but to peruse the MYSTERY of JESUITISM, (particularly Letter ninth, Letter seventh, and Letter sixth, beginning at *p.* 122.) and see whether it may not be concluded *George* is almost as good an Artist at it as *they*, or at least, if he be not fit (and a towardly Youth) for their *School*, to teach people how to *equivocate* (not to say *ly*) neatly, by DIRECTING the INTENTION: and if *George* or *Solomon Eccles* may direct the Intention in THIS, why not in OTHER things: And if *George*, why not the *Jesuites*? Or if the *Jesuites*, Why not *George*? And this being once set thus on foot, who hath *power* to stop it, or who can tell where it may center, except *GEORGE FOX*, or the *POPE*? For if *George* or *SOL.* may in *DOCTRINALS*, or Cases of *BLASPHEMY*, why may not the Jesuites in MORALS and in Cases of THEFT, LYING and ADULTERY? I desire you *Friends* seriously to weigh and consider this, and what can certainly *satisfy* you and others herein. When the *Quakers* shall *speak* or write one thing, and tell you *themselves* they *mean* another, or do not intend all they *speak or write*.

But heres the misery on't; If Mr. *Hicks* or *any* of your *Opponents* do but write, A for THE, or do but say a DIALOGUE, and not BY WAY OF DIALOGUE, or do but say *YOU* for *THOU*, or the like, Oh then it is Forgery, Lies, Blasphemous Slanders, Sinful, impure, and Corrupt: then it is not a *little Failure in Syntax only*, which the *Law* of *Charity* would not take notice of. But let a Quaker say or write that which is a hundred times worse, nay though

though it be *in it ſelf* Blaſphemy againſt Chriſt; Yet then it is only a *little Failure in Syntax*, and againſt the *Law* of *Charity* to reflect on a Man, *&c.*

10. Upon this occaſion I could not but *lament* ('tis not unlikely another would have *ſmiled*) to ſee that *G. W.* in his ſerious ſearch, *p.* 24. hath ſuch a rare Invention (I will not ſay Black-Art) that if *Jer. Ives* does but ſay, *if you dare appoint time and place* [to diſcourſe about the Quakers Religion and Miniſters] *George* can and hath tranſform'd, (I will not ſay Conjur'd) it, into an *Inſolent frothy Challenge, and like the common* Hectors and Sword-men *of the times.* But three or four *Challenges* that three grand *Quakers viz. G. Fox. E. Burroughs*, and *Sol. Eccles* made, wherein *the very ſame words are*, and *abundantly more audacious*, as a *Challenge at two Weapons, Name, Perſons, Time and Place, a Duel, and if you DARE*, (as is worth your ſeeing more at large in *J. Ives Queſt.* for the Quakers) yet *George*'s *Holineſs* hath *Pope-like* ſanctified them, and they are ſerious Challenges, on a ſerious Religious Account. Oh excellent *Religion!* But the other he Condemns, (as if it were *Curſt* with Bell, Book, and Candle) in *p.* 19, 20, and 23. Oh *wonderful George!* that hath ſuch a POWER to *Sanctify* and *unſanctify* words with a ſmall *daſh* of his *Pen* as he *pleaſes.*

Here I ſay is the *Miſery*, and this is the moſt groſs abominable *Hypocriſy*, *unreaſonableneſs*, *Partiality*, *and uncharitableneſs* that can be heard of, againſt the *Light* of Nature, the *Light* of Conſcience and the *Light* of Scripture: *That the* ſame *things* or ten times worſe *ſhould be no faults or but little trivial ones in Quakers*, and *yet groſs falſhoods, horrible lies and Forgeries in other men.* The *Lord* open your eyes,

that

that you may first learn to *Judg* your selves, and *Cast* the *Beam* out of your *own* eye, before you go to cast the *Mote* out of anothers.

11. Now for your *saying* & *unsaying*, *Backwards* and *forwards*, I have *particularly* manifested it in this my *Reply*, G. F. *condemning* what G. W. *uses*, and G. W. *condemning* what G. K. *used*, and W. P. *condemning* what G. W. *Teaches*, and sometimes G. W. *condemning and confuting* G. W. *himself*, and so round and round again: But now notwithstanding all this (considering what their *Practices* above related have been, and that they are *generally* such) I do *expect* and must not doubt in the least, but that they will have that **stupendous Confidence**, as to *deny* all this, (or not *confess* it,) yea, and will say, it is *false and horrid Slanders*, **though we read it, we see it with our eyes, and hear it with our ears**, yet our **senses** *must be all* **deceived**; and the *Quakers only in the Truth*: and if any will, they may, believe them not only *before* (but *against*) their *own Eyes*, I cannot help it, neither shall I concern my self much at it, But only to express my real *sorrow* for to see any one so *strangely* **deluded**.

What *else* may I? What must I? nay what can I *expect* from *such* Men, that have in *this manner* so often declared themselves in *Print* already, who can undertake to *vindicate falshoods* and *nonsence*, and their grand false *Prophet* G. F. and *call this a vindication of the Truth, or Spirit of Truth*. (Is G. *Fox* the Truth, or *Spirit of Truth*? no certainly, much less then, are his *Falsehoods* and *nonsence*, the Truth or *Spirit of Truth*) and who will *vindicate* such words as are in *themselves* no less than **Blasphemy**, asserting, it may be *said* yea, and *SO* said of

George

George Fox, as it was *said of* CHRIST, That he was in the World, and the World was made by him and the World knew him not, whom John said he was not: nay, and this is not only set down without *exception*; but on the contrary, a parity or likeness *affirmed* that SO it may be said of this true Prophet [G. *Fox*:] now we believe it was *truly* said of CHRIST.

12. 'I doubt not but that I may with *safety* say, *That* 'Mr. *Penn, and* G. *Whitehead* (*if either of them* '*please*) *may with as much* Truth, Honour *and* 'Sence, and *with as little* BLASPHEMY *undertake* to vindicate and Justify POOR ROBINS 'Position *and Allegorical* Proof, That the Moon is made of Green Cheese.

'And though this at first may seem *strange* to 'some Persons that may *read* it, yet I speak it '*considerately* and not *rashly*, and do really 'think that if any *Judicious* Person does but '*duly* weigh the one and the other, he will find it so; and yet these are the Pretending *Divinely-Commissioned and Inspired Prophets and Ministers, and the Infallible Doctors of the only True Church; which undervalue and Condemn all the* World besides.

Surely, had they instead of this *Arrogance* and *Pride*, but a little *Humility* and *Charity*, it would make them quite of another *mind*; and *thus all that will, may see how they RESPECT Persons among the Quakers, and what DIVINE HONOUR, some of them give, and DIVINE POWER they ascribe, to their grand Prophet* George Fox.

God in his Infinite mercy, open the eyes of all *ſincere-hearted* (though not ſo *diſcerning*, yet) well-meaning **Chriſtians**, 'That they may underſtand 'and ſee that it is abſolute FOLLY (if not MAD-'neſs) for any one to turn from another **Church** to 'the **Quakers**, ſince they do produce no **real** or cer-tain Diſcriminating *Teſtimony* and *Evidence* (but on-'ly their **bare** ſay-ſo) nor do SAY any MORE than 'others can, no nor yet ſo much as many other '*Churches* in ſome things do.

And this I leave with you and all, ſeriouſly to *conſider* and judiciouſly to *weigh* in the Ballance of true *Judgment*.

T. T

THE

246.
99

THE Quakers Character OF THE QUAKERS QUIBBLES.

1. IN the *first* place, I was given to underſtand that Mr. *Ed. Billing* (having been at the *Quakers* Cabal) was firſt pleaſed to beſtow this *Character* on't, *viz. That it was the Quibblers Quibbles, and that was Anſwer enough to it.*

Reply.——*Honeſt Ned hath hit the Nail o'th head*: For the Quibbles I am certain were the Quakers; and thus then (by their old Friends confeſſion) the Quakers *are* ſtill the Quibblers. But I ſuppoſe he did not there find any of theſe Quibbles. *Oh if thou couldſt but ſee my heart within, as plainly as thou ſeeſt my Face without, Thou wouldſt not deny*——*as I am a man, as I am an Engliſh man, as I am a Chriſtian I will*——However, if this little Epiſtle be any, yet certainly, not *ſuch a Quibble, as modeſt Ned B's little Paper, Printed for ſatisfaction of*——There was a *Quibble* indeed, a grand *Quibble* with a witneſs, ſo *loud* that it was heard through the Kingdom; thus he might have been *ſilent*, or better *Anſwered* himſelf: And 'tis no ſmall *Quibble* of the *Quakers*, to *own* any

Persons privately, whilſt they pretend to *diſown* them *publickly*.

2. *Thomas Taunton* a Quaker, Characterized it on this wiſe, *That that Pamphlet was made by a Cabal of Anabaptiſts, and was a meer Forgery, &c.*

Reply. This Man I declare to be a *falſe* Prophet, and that his Revelation herein was a meer *Forgery*, (to ſpeak in his own Language) for there was not one *Baptiſt* or *Anabaptiſt* did ſee it or know any thing of it, till after it was *written* & delivered to the *Bookſeller*; as I have before declared as in the preſence of God, and therefore this *Quaker* was herein led by a *Falſe Light*, or a *Falſe Spirit*, and hath abuſed and wronged the *Baptiſts* with a matter abſolutely *UNTRUE*.

3. Laſtly, it paſt it ſeems the *Cenſure* of one *Tho. Rudyard*, which I heare was on this wiſe: *He being askt, if he did not think it was an ingenious piece, anſwered No, and that he* Believed *a Boy of ten years old might write as Rational a thing, and that the Author deſigned to make a piece of* Drollery, *but not having Wit enough, brought it forth an* Hermophrodite.

Reply. If *T. R.* thinks good, to call (his Brethren) the Quakers *Quibbles*, Drollery, I cannot help it, let them call him to an account for that; but I am much of *T. R's* mind, that their Quibbles want wit enough (though not Confidence) to make a piece of Drollery, and ſo come forth but an Hermophrodite: Witneſs *T. R's own Quibbling Anſwer, to Jer. Ives ſober Requeſt*, who therein *Quibbled* ſo finely and *Drolled* ſo long with *Jeremy* about Oaths, and being *that Jeremy, &c.* till at laſt he brought that *Jeremy* in good *earneſt* upon all their Backs, who hath given ſome of their Grand ones their *Bellies-full*

of

of Swearing and Oaths too, in his *Questions for the Quakers*.

Now this of *T. R*'s might be such a *rational* and *ingenious* piece indeed, as it may be a Boy of ten years old might not, and yet a Boy of about thirty might *Write*: And I have heard that some of *T. R*'s own *Brethren* have looke upon it, as a very *Ridiculous* and *silly* thing for him to write so about Swearing as he did, but that he *deals* so much in it; and a *Quaker* may be *Fool-hardy*, as well as others, why not? Had I been *John Osgood*, or *Gerard Roberts*, I would rather have given *T. R.* fifty pounds, than to have had my Name brought upon the Stage in so *grose* a matter, as here *T. R.* by his *over-self-conceited-Ingenuity* hath wondrous well *occasioned*, to no small shame of the *Quakers*.

Let *Thomas Rudyard* compare his Practice of *SUEING* people with *James Naylors* Doctrine [*Possession of the Living Faith, p. 7.*] *It was never the Faith of Christ to SUE, Contend, &c.* and and *T. R.* may see, what an *Hermaphrodite-Quaker* himself will appear.

Besides, one might take notice here of a *Quakers* Belief; but let that pass, as not being worth taking *notice*; For they manifest sufficiently, they regard not much what they say or write, so it may but *undervalue* others and *arrogantly lift up* themselves.

FINIS.

Mr. *Smith*,

YOU *having ſo well and carefully publiſhed* the former, *I have thought fit to ſend you by this Porter, &c. do Recommend this* ſecond Part of the Quakers-Quibbles *to your like Care; and deſire you to ask no* Queſtions. *Only I muſt requeſt this favour of you (if without too much trouble to you it may be done) That if any ſober* Perſon, *or Civil* Quaker, *ſhall ſuſpect or doubt whether* I have truely cited the Quakers words out of their own Books; *That if they come to you, and deſire it, you would procure ſuch of the Quakers Books as they ſhall make queſtion of (if you can find, or have them) and ſhew them at your ſhop, for their better ſatisfaction*, that ſo they may believe their OWN EYES at leaſt. *And that you ſend one of this ſecond Part to Mr.* Whitehead, *and another to Mr.* Penn. *So farewell,*

Thy friend though unknown,

Jan. 1. $7\frac{4}{5}$.

T. T.